Revisiting the past:

Social organisation of remembering

and reconciliation

by

Kyoko Murakami

A doctoral thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirement
for the award of
Doctor of Philosophy of Loughborough University

December 2001

ABSTRACT

The thesis examines social practices of reconciliation regarding British prisoners of war's experience of captivity by the Japanese in World War II. It draws on theoretical issues of social remembering, discursive psychology and discourse analysis. It concerns the social organisation of identity and accountability, i.e., ways in which issues of identity, blame, apology and forgiveness concerning past actions and events are used to address the significance of reconciliation. Talk and texts are examined to understand how private and collective memories of the past are mobilised and made relevant to present and future lives of the POWs.

The text data consist of letters to the editor which appeared in a national newspaper in response to British veterans' staged protest against the Japanese emperor's visit to Britain in 1998. The analysis illustrates the ways in which identity descriptions were used to achieve social actions of blaming, justifying, apologising, and forgiving. Following this event, interviews were conducted with a group of former British POWs and their family members who participated in a reconciliation trip to Japan nearly 50 years after the war. Within the analytic framework of accountability of the war-time past, discussions centre on cultural otherness, the language of the past, moral accountability and interdependencies of public and private remembering. The discourse and conversation analytic concepts include membership categorisation device, sequential organisation of interaction, recipient design, footing and alignment. The interviews offered interactional settings where the ex-POW participants establish shared understanding of the past events collaboratively with the Japanese interviewer, while displaying sensitivity in claiming their problems of the past to the interviewer. Such sensitivity management provides grounds for discursive reconciliation. This is contrasted with cognitive psychological explanations that insist on a change of attitude and mental states, resolution of inner conflict or achieving harmony within the individual. The overall argument is that reconciliation is a moment-by-moment discursive accomplishment in which the ex-POW participants actively engage in interaction with cultural others and constantly evaluate and reconfigure the significance of the past.

Keywords: *remembering, reconciliation, identity, accountability, discursive psychology, Prisoners of war*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

Point of departure: The Event

In late May of 1998 the Japanese emperor and empress made a state visit to the United Kingdom. On May 27, scores of former British prisoners of war in W.W.II organised and staged protests against the Japanese emperor as its state procession made its way up the Mall to Buckingham Palace. They opposed the hosting of the state visit of the Japanese emperor, who in their view had not provided a satisfactory level of apology and compensation concerning the Japanese military's treatment of prisoners of war in Far East during the war. The anti-Japanese sentiment of the protesters was widely reported in the news media during this state visit. A former POW burned the Japanese flag on the Royal party as the state parade passed by. A group ex-POW's and family members turned their backs and whistled Colonel Bogey (the theme tune from David Lean's celebrated film "The Bridge on the River Kwai"). The photographed images of the flag burning and other acts of protest were prominently featured on the front cover of many of the following day's national newspapers along with interviews and witness accounts and testimonies of the trauma and suffering of the former POW's and their family members.

Throughout the state visit the British media covered the Japanese emperor's visit detailing official activities and visits to various parts of Britain and receptions hosted by the British Royal family and the government. There was also extensive coverage of welcoming events organised by local communities in England and Wales. The whereabouts and activities of the Japanese dignitaries dominated the headlines of prime-time news and daily newspapers across the nation. On the one hand, there were media images of friendly welcome given to the Japanese emperor celebrating the positive picture of the contemporary Anglo-Japanese relations. On the other hand, there were images of angry and teary faces of the former POWs and their family members, evoking negative associations with history of war, violence and lost lives.

Such media coverage re-ignited nation-wide debate concerning the hostile and distressed voices of representatives of Far Eastern veterans' organisations and family members of deceased former POWs. Diverse views and opinions were expressed featuring memories of the camp and stories of many years of suffering from physical

and psychological problems. Meanwhile, the media presenting contrasting views of British and Japanese diplomats, politicians and business leaders, appeasing the views of vociferous former prisoners of wars. These arguments concerned the promotion of cultural understanding and emphasised the benefit of nurturing amicable Anglo-Japanese relations in connection with the continuous Japanese investments to stimulate British economy and generate more employment opportunities in Britain.

Even though the World War II ended over half a century ago and Japan has re-established high profile membership in the global economy and international community of politics and diplomacy, WWII experiences remain a live issue. The Japanese Emperor's state visit prompted a re-examination of war responsibility, restitution and reparation, and apology concerning the Japanese military aggression and atrocities perpetrated during W.W.II. My main concern is with what it is to remember and forget the past and how people's understanding and memories of the past shape the way people handle the issue of war responsibility. The debate provides a setting to study the way in which people remember and forget the war and how the past concerning the war continues to resonate in the present. In other words, the present status of the past becomes a topic of live concern (Middleton and Edwards, 1990; 1997). From this perspective, I approach the question of how people remember and forget the past by examining the disparate range of social actions in which people engaged themselves and how those social actions were occasioned by this state visit. In this thesis, my aim is to examine reconciliation and apology as a discursive practice.

I offer a few disclaimers in order to clarify the scope of the present study. The study does not aim to provide advice and suggestions as to how to attain successful reconciliation practices. Nor does it aim to offer an objective measure or standard for accessing existing programs and activities for reconciliation. Neither is it an oral history project, despite the fact that it generated a large corpus of data, including various witness accounts, experiential narratives, anecdotes and textual materials such as diaries, letters, and stories, contributed by the former POWs and other participants. They expressed to me their wishes that the materials would be used as source for keeping historical records. However, the research does not aim to challenge a view of, or rewrite modern history regarding WWII, its events and people's experiences. I do not intend to contest a widely accepted status of historical events, although some might be debated on their factual status. I take those events as commonsense

knowledge of our past as they are known to the general public. I do not take any responsibility for the potential inaccuracy of the events that were informed by the participants in the current study. I take what the participants claimed in my research as their perspectives on their experiences.

In addition, the current study is not motivated to condemn any government, organisation or group or individual. Nor is it concerned to exert political influences on legal decisions and diplomatic relations between governments and the like, and on policy making processes of the political and any other organisations involved in activities for reconciliation. As a Japanese national, I do have moral concerns over Japan's handling of war responsibility and compensation to those who suffered from atrocities and destruction committed by the Japanese military forces. But this thesis is not written as part of any moral crusade to influence the present movements and future decisions regarding the issues of the former POWs' claim for compensation and apology. There are some scholars in Japan whose academic work has transformed into a political crusade for reconciliation sided with particular veteran's organisations. Such work is widely publicised in popular journals and newspapers in Japan as well as scholarly journals (e.g., Nakao, 2000). The study has been carried out solely by the author under the auspices of the university within the social and cultural context of university research and not funded by any external organisations. Hence, I have no obligation and commitment to account for a particular person, group or institution and to articulate political and social consequences and implications of this study.

Working for reconciliation

To date, there are several known reconciliation programs and activities that the Japanese government recognises. The Japanese government supports these initiatives which aim to promote reconciliation between the UK and Japan with varying degrees of involvement and endorsement. There are four initiatives officially recognised in the web site of the Japanese embassy (see http://www.embjapan.org.uk/). The four groups named Pacific Venture, Burma Campaign Fellowship Group (BCFG), Agape, Japan 2001: Planting Trees for Peace are currently acknowledged as official in the Japanese Embassy's web site. These initiatives were launched late 1980s to early 1990s. In conjunction with the British government and organisations such as the Royal British Legion and the Burma Campaign Fellowship Group, a number of Joint Memorial Visits have also been arranged. As part of this programme, British and Japanese ex-

servicemen have travelled together to attend joint memorial services at the former battlefields such as Kohima in Northeast India. There are veteran's groups and associations who work to gain compensation from the Japanese government. In fact, the situation to do with compensation has changed over the course of the thesis research. In November 2000, the British government agreed to award £1000 to the former Far Eastern prisoners of war and the family members of those who were deceased. The legal battle between Japanese government and British veterans' and former civilian internee's organisations are still under way.

The aforementioned groups differ from one another in their origin, history, mission statement, funding sources, and target members, as well as areas of current reconciliatory activities. Their target members and types of activities range from organising and executing a memorial and reconciliation trip to Japan for those ex-POWs who were in captivity by the Japanese during the WWII to cultural exchange trips of young students who are grandchildren of former POWs and civilian internees. They all commonly devote their long-running efforts "to promote understanding and reconciliation between the UK and Japan" (Embassy-of-Japan, 2000). Many of the leaders of these groups were awarded the Japanese Foreign Minister's commendation and the medal of honour (e.g., OBE) from the Queen. We can see that reconciliation activities have an element of cross-cultural understanding between the British and the Japanese. Some of the grandchildren of the former POWs and civilian internees are taking the opportunity to go to Japan in order to meet Japanese people in contemporary Japanese society. The visit is designed to promote cross-generational understanding between the people who lived through the war time and their posterity about the events of World War II. It also aims to foster the cross-cultural understanding between the Japanese and the British in the present context, while learning to take into account the historical background and political circumstances in which the war happened. For wider concerns, the significance of reconciliation appeals to more global concerns (e.g., hope, peace, friendship, and harmony) with links to international institutions and non-profit organisations.

Reconciliation activities come in the guise of cross-cultural exchange programs, which create opportunities for two parties to meet and communicate with one another, sharing their own ideas and perceptions about the other. Such programs aim to change people's view of the cultural other, for the purpose of celebrating similarities and accepting differences and ultimately reaching a new common ground.

The reconciliation activity I chose to study fits in this framework of promoting and achieving cross-cultural understanding between the former British prisoners of war in the Far East and concerned Japanese expatriates in Britain.

I first came into contact with those former POW's when I attended a seminar at the end of October in 1998, several months after the staged protests against the Japanese emperor. The seminar was called "Toward the Greater Cross Cultural Understandings" hosted by School of Asian and Oriental Studies, University of London. The seminar was open to the general public. It included talks by several invited speakers representing university community, media and journalism, and veteran's associations in Britain and Japan. Following from the talks, a discussion forum was opened up for everyone, inviting the audience members questions. Among those audience members who were present at the seminar, I became acquainted with a few Japanese expatriates who helped organise the first reconciliation trip in 1992, what is known as "the Iruka Boys' pilgrimage to Japan." I kept in touch with one of them, and she agreed to help me with the research as an informant. I conducted an interview with her to obtain the general information on the reconciliation trip in terms of how it came into being, who took part in it, what was the outcome of the trip. Based on the information provided by the informant, I decided to keep a focus on this first reconciliation trip as a pivotal event for the former POWs to speak about their experience of captivity in Far East and their views on reconciliation. I proceeded to make arrangements for conducting interviews with them—developing the interview schedule and working out the logistics of the interviews. Who exactly are the Iruka Boys, the people that I decided to meet for interview? Why did it take nearly half a century to come to reconciliation? How did the reconciliation trip happen?

Reconciliation: The beginning

During World War II in summer of 1942, three hundred Far East Prisoners of War (FEPOWs) were sent to work in a copper mine in a place then known as Iruka, situated deep in the mountains of central Japan. Initially, they were captured in 1941 and had been working as prisoners of war on the infamous Thai-Burma Railway, known as "the death railway." Many claim that the camp in Iruka was much better than the camps in Thailand. The FEPOWs worked alongside Japanese miners and schoolchildren in Iruka. Before the end of the war, sixteen of them died due to illness and diseases in the camp. A grave of the dead with a small wooden cross was built at

the edge of the village by the fellow POWs. At the end of the war, the POWs returned to Britain. Sometime after the war local Japanese villagers moved this grave to a new location, about 100 meters away from its original site. Along with the relocation process, the grave was refurbished and a memorial was erected. What used to be a small grave was transformed into a cemetery with a large copper cross in the centre and a marble slab with names of the sixteen solders engraved in English. To respect the war dead and celebrate the completion of the village-wide project of building the new cemetery, local dignitaries, elders, residents along with former student workers who worked in the copper mine with the British POWs, held a memorial service in late 1980s. The building of this cemetery dramatically changed many people's lives. After the war the prison camp operation discontinued, and the government-owned copper mine and its refinery were privatised. The only sign of the British presence during the war was the cemetery. In late 1980's, this cemetery caught the attentions of a Japanese tourist (Keiko Holmes), who happened to notice the newly refurbished cemetery in her homecoming visit. She was a native of the village, born a few years after the war, and left the village after school. She later married an English man and has lived in London since then. The cemetery had also come to the attention of Father Bede Cleary, who was a catholic priest at a city in the area. He and his colleague from England, Father Murphy, were driving by this village and happened to find this cemetery, which revealed a unknown history of the WWII associated with Britain. Father Murphy was so intrigued and impressed with the cemetery built by the Japanese that he wrote about his experience and the story behind the cemetery in a catholic newspaper published in UK. A former Iruka Boy, a nickname of the POWs in Iruka, happened to read Father Murphy's article and soon contacted him regarding the article. Until then, the existence of the cemetery was virtually unknown to the Japanese outside the village, let alone to the British. With the help of the villagers, Father Murphy and Keiko Holmes got in touch with one another, and series of correspondence between the British and the Japanese began. Keiko was soon in touch with the surviving former POWs in Iruka and began visiting them in their homes in England for materialising a reconciliation trip.

The first reconciliation trip took place in October 1992 and twenty-eight former British POWs and their family members attended the trip. Keiko Holmes and Kayoko Mori, her assistant and interpreter, accompanied the group. In October 1998, I met Kayoko at the SOAS public seminar and learned about the reconciliation trip

and remarkable efforts that were put into it. The trip was initiated and supported by those who were concerned with the importance of reconciliation, not by the government and any other official organisations. It was purely as a result of the tremendous amount of grassroots efforts of both British and Japanese people who shared the common goal of achieving reconciliation regarding the war and better understanding between the two peoples. It was this aspect of reconciliation that intrigued me. What drives people to devote their energy and passion and became involved in such an activity? What is it that makes the experience of reconciliation so meaningful to those who do not live through the war and still feel that they are part of it? What does it mean to remember the problematic past such as war and to be reconciled with it? These questions formed the basis for conceiving this thesis research on remembering and reconciliation.

In April 1999, I set out to interview surviving former POWs and their family members who took part in this reconciliation trip. The key interview question concerned why they decided to go on the reconciliation trip. This question was designed to elicit their accounts of wartime captivity and post-war experiences of living and coping with difficult times—war-related illnesses and diseases, trauma and presumably any other medical problems. Also, the interview invited them to share their views on reconciliation with the troubling past. These interviews were analysed in terms of the ways in which they reveal the discursive psychological issues--social organisation of identity and accountability. The present study employs the discursive analytic approach (or discursive psychological approach), explicating the ways in which people use language to accomplish the social action of reconciliation. In the next section, I will provide an overview of the thesis, highlighting key theoretical themes and analytic concepts in each chapter.

Overview of the thesis

Chapter 1 is a literature review, covering literatures pertaining to social remembering and reconciliation. The underlined themes are the critical approach to the cognitive-experimental tradition of psychology of remembering, social action orientation to memory and remembering, identity and accountability and the discursive approach to reconciliation. Chapter 2 provides methodological orientations to the study of reconciliation as social practice. The approach employed is the discursive approach widely practised in discourse analysis and discursive psychology. The chapter offers a

brief overview of the development of these two research programs, by identifying some key philosophical foundations and theoretical assumptions on which the programs are based. The latter part of the chapter is dedicated to the explication of active interviewing, in which the discursive reconciliation is realised. It discusses some key distinctions between the discursive approach and the traditional qualitative approach to interview. It argues that active interviewing is not merely a method to collect data, but the interview itself provides a participatory framework and interactional setting where members' meanings and knowledge are produced, contested and reconfigured constantly. This view supports the main argument of the thesis that the interview itself is a social practice of discursive reconciliation. The discursive approach makes visible the social organisation of the past in terms of identity construction and accountability work. Chapter 3, on Identity-in-action, presents a primary introduction to discourse analytic concepts by analysing the textual material consisting of letters to the editor of a British national newspaper *The Independent*. The analysis of the letters features a performative nature of language use in categories of identities and their descriptions. The chapter offers a rationale for pursuing further the discursive analytic concepts in the talk data for the following three chapters –focused on the aspects of accountability: accounting for others, accounting for the past and accounting for change.

Chapter 4 is the first of trilogy of studies of accountability of the problematic past. The notion of otherness and ethnification are explored by examining the POWs accounting practices for others, in particular the Japanese camp guards as cultural others. The analysis illustrates the ways in which the participants construct cultural otherness interactionally, while doing social remembering. The selected extracts all relate to the talk about rice, where the participants and the interviewer use rice as a discursive resource and jointly construct the cultural otherness while claiming their identity. In talk about rice, rice can be viewed as a membership categorisation device at work. Rice as membership category was used to ethnify the interviewer as they produce a claim about their problem with Japanese cultural practices and specifically address their difficulty with rice diet. In such talk both parties, the ex-POW participants and the Japanese interviewer, display their sensitivity to one another and manage their turn-taking and conversational topics, as they attend to potential problems without turning hostile and abrasive to one another. Several interactional features are considered in looking at participants' sensitive management of talk and

problematic claims about the past. They include the use of humour and irony for mitigating tension between the speakers without conflict or conversational breakdown. Similarly, the analysis looks at the role of laughter, in particular the ways in which laughter is produced in managing interactional tensions and sensitive issues of the past in terms of recipient design. Chapter 5, carrying over the analytic concept of ethnification and construction of cultural otherness, explores the accountability for the past. The analysis focuses on the ex-POW participant's ubiquitous use of Japanese words and phrases in the interview talk and examines the rhetorical functions of such use as work of accountability for the past. I call these Japanese words and phrases "the language of the past" as they were picked up when the participants were at the POW camp in Japan. The language of the past is a discursive resource to perform social actions—accounting for the troubling past and telling their experience as to what it is to live in a Japanese camp and live with the troubling past for fifty post-war years. Chapter 6 is the last of the trilogy of accountability concerning the participants' ways of accounting for change, namely redemption. In the group interview setting, the ways in which narratives about the past were produced by the participants reveals the constitutive process of particular identities and membership in a given social relation of the interaction. In telling redemption narratives, the participants addressed moral sensibility of the past and expressed their changed position according to the present position that they occupy with issues relating to reconciliation. In other words, the analysis illustrates the ways in which the participants claimed their changed position and the significance of the past is reconfigured in situ interactionally in the telling of the redemption narratives. The analytic concepts featured in this analysis are the rhetorical effects of the use of footing and reported speech and a dialogic nature of story telling. The chapter also argues that such narration engenders the interactional opportunities where the participants address publicly and privately relevant issues of morality regarding the particular past. Such interdependency of public and private significance of the past is studiable from the discursive approach to social remembering and reconciliation. Chapter 7 presents the overall conclusion of the thesis and addresses theoretical and methodological implications for the future studies of reconciliation and social remembering from a discursive psychological approach.

The thesis presents and illustrates its value of taking a discursive approach to studying reconciliation as a situated social activity of remembering. Drawing on an eclectic compilation of literatures on social remembering and reconciliation, it starts

with identifying key theoretical and analytical issues with the social organisation of the past. This provides a rationale for focusing on analytic concepts of identity and accountability. The methodological discussion on discourse analysis and discursive psychology highlights a non-cognitive approach to studying how people claim to have memory, knowledge, and understanding of the past events and actions. The discussion gives an empirical basis for examining people's accounting practices in remembering and reconciliation. The overall argument is that the interview is a social setting where a situated discursive accomplishment of reconciliation is empirically observed. The analysis and discussions of the discourse examples elaborate on this argument. Showcasing major features of rhetorical and discursive resources used in the letter writing, a discourse analysis explicates a performative nature of identity as to how people address the importance of reconciliation and apology. The following three chapters focus on interview talk, exploring the social nature of accountability practices--accounting for others, accounting for the past, and accounting for change. Accountability is examined in terms of alignment, footing, recipient design, positioning, ethnification, membership categorisation, the situated use of the language of the past, and interdependency of the private and public significance of the past. This illustrates various ways in which participants display their orientation to cultural identity, and handle delicate issues of the war-time past in the interview talk. I call this sensitivity management that is part of accountability work. The implications of the analysis points to some promising ways of following up the study, while identifying contributions of the study and future remit that is left to tackle.

CHAPTER 1

Social organisation of the past: Remembering and reconciliation

Introduction

The literature regarding remembering and reconciliation embraces many social sciences disciplines: philosophy, psychology, sociology, anthropology, political science, cultural studies and the like. The psychology of memory is largely preoccupied with representation of reality and interested in a question of dualism, whether memory is a property of the individual or the social outcome. This dualism has steered our thinking and understanding of memory and remembering for many centuries since the classical period of Greek scholarship. However, the survey of historical roots on studies of memory informs us that the concern with resolving this classic dualism presents us with inexhaustive accounts of how memory works. First, it seems to forestall our understanding the 'social' nature of remembering. Second, memory has been conceived as a fixed, static mental state as an outcome of information processing. Instead of attempting to resolve this dualism, the thesis focuses on duality, how the individual and the social are enmeshed in psychology of remembering and reconciliation. Here remembering and reconciliation are conceived in terms of the social organisation of the past, how the past is socially constructed and organised (Shotter, 1991). Remembering is presented as a dynamic human 'activity' in which sense-making is performed and shared-ness of meanings are achieved with use of language.

I approach the concept of reconciliation as a discursive practice, within which a communicative action of remembering elucidates social organisation of the past. The starting point of the review is, in borrowing Cole's term, to consider "memory as a socioculturally constituted process in which the individual and the social are united in cultural artefacts" (Cole in Middleton and Edwards, 1990, pp. viii-ix). The work mentioned in this chapter is in line with the view that memory and remembering is a socially organised activity rather than a concern with individual experience and

'internal' cognitive processes and content (e.g., Wertsch, 1987; Middleton and Edwards, 1990).

This chapter offers a review of literature related to the key themes of the thesis—remembering and reconciliation. Although they do not necessarily carry conceptually equal currency and are not mutually exclusive notions, remembering and reconciliation conceptually overlap in principle as they are both regarded as discursive practices. My aim in this chapter is to examine the consequence of the social vs. individual dualism in the development of psychological work of memory and remembering. Second, I aim to present a line of work that focuses on empirical issues related to identity and accountability in the social organisation of remembering. Third, with a selected review of the reconciliation literature, I present an argument for adopting a discursive approach to reconciliation in distinction to the conventional, cognitive approach. In achieving these aims, my specific tasks are as follows: first, to highlight principal features of discursive psychological approach to remembering, that include variability, the dilemmatic nature of remembering, the issue of truth, accuracy and authenticity in remembering. This becomes a basis for presenting psychological and sociological work relevant to the notion of accountability and accounting practices. As part of accounting practices, I will focus on shared nature and action orientation to remembering, in which issues related to social construction of identity are explored. Drawing on the notions of cultural tools and mediation, a theoretical link between identity and narratives is explored as to how narratives, history and other cultural resources contribute to the discursive constitution of identity. I also discuss how they are put to use in performing social actions in remembering a contentious past. The social nature of remembering is further explored in terms of people's accountability of the past. In this section, the notion of time and place is reconsidered from the discursive approach. Also, the interdependency of public and private memory is addressed to counter the orthodox approach to psychology of memory. Lastly, I present a selection of the contemporary research on reconciliation and evaluate the current view of reconciliation from the discursive perspective of memory and remembering. In so doing, I identify key implications of studying remembering as social action for an understanding of reconciliation as a discursive accomplishment.

Remembering as mental vs. discursive

In order to understand the current status and direction of research on memory and remembering, it is useful to trace the historical roots of studies on the social nature of memory and remembering. For example, Middleton and Edwards (Middleton and Edwards, 1990) have provided an overview of historical context in memory research as they position their approach to previous studies of memory. The basic lines of theoretical and empirical work can be traced back a hundred years ago to work in various social sciences disciplines, including that of sociology (e.g., Durkheim, 1893/1984; 1895/1982; Halbwachs, 1925/1952; Mead, 1934; 1951/1980); psychology (e.g., Janet, 1928; Vygotsky, 1929; Bartlett, 1932/1995) and his colleagues (Luria, 1968; Loentiev, 1981), and anthropology (e.g., Evans-Prichard, 1937/1950). For the sake of the discussion and to avoid making a technical distinction, I suggest that the words 'collective' and 'social' are interchangeably used. What is common in this body of work is that they focus on the social organisation and process of remembering, instead of taking a cognitive, reductionist experimental approach to memory.

A number of sociological works on memory also emphasise "the impersonal aspect of our recollections, reminding us that what we 'remember' includes more than just what we have personally experienced" (Zerubavel, 1996, p. 289). Sociologists such as Zerubavel urge that the study of memory does not solely belong to the experimental psychologist showcase. Although anecdotal, Zerubavel's example of his first trip to Venice better illustrates the point that memory counts as more than what you personally or directly experienced. He recalls that he claimed to remember the scenes of Venice that he saw in the book twenty years before he actually went to Venice. He was actually seeing something he already "remembered" from a book he had read twenty years earlier. What seems to matter here is what people 'say or claim to remember' rather than what is it that they remember and whether it is a direct experience or not. This point suggests that the focus of investigation is on the discursive phenomena, rather than the mental state of memory.

Other newly emerged perspectives take an active interest in memory. Examples include "popular memory" (Johnson, McLennan et al., 1982) as the social construction of a historical figure. Oral historians, for example, are interested in a particular way of memory construction at a particular time (e.g. Schrager, 1983). Folklorists and scholars in communication studies (e.g., Davis and Starn, 1989) tend to focus on collective or social memory by examining folklore and media revealing

communicative practices in terms of reconstruction and creation of shared memories (Middleton and Edwards, 1990).

All of the above-mentioned work highlights the importance of, and need for, developing studies of memory. The social organisation of memory and remembering can not be explained purely in terms of an individual process of encoding and decoding as part of mental representations. If remembering is socially organised, then what matters is not the content, or what is remembered (or forgotten), but how people use what it is to remember and what counts as memory in a particular social setting. With this in mind, I approach remembering as a situated discursive activity, rather than a static state of mind or a mental process.

This view of memory and remembering allows us to attend to the other side of the same coin, forgetting. Forgetting and amnesia have discernible social properties that are congruent to those of memory and remembering. Such work portrays the politics of memory related to war events. Examples include Kundera (1983) on systematicity of forgetting of political and cultural events in late sixties Czechoslovakia; Sturken (1997) on politics of representation of Vietnam war memorials; Ehrenhaus, (1989) on the contradictory injunctions of remembrance and forgetting of the Vietnam War, Brockmeier (in press) on narratives and cultural memory on book-burning during in WWII Germany; Lynch and Bogen (1996) on social production of history in Iran Contra hearing. Also, the studies of social forgetting were motivated by an impetus for re-examination of the previous psychological and anthropological work; for example, Billig (1999) on Freudian repression and forgetting in psychoanalysis, Douglas (1987(1986)) on institutional forgetting, Shotter (1990) on the discussion of the social-institutional determinants of remembering and forgetting in Bartlett's work. These studies suggest that forgetting is not separable from remembering. They also suggest that the study of remembering and forgetting highlights the social nature of identity and accountability of a problematic past. These two discursive analytic concepts—identity construction and accountability comprise the crux of the analysis, which provides an empirical basis for discursive reconciliation.

Similar critique to the traditional approach to psychology of memory was made by Barclay (1994) in support for a discursive analytic approach. Experimental psychology treats memory as a property of the individual and separates it from any socio-cultural interactive elements disregarding history and locally organised cultural

conventions. The result is that you have a piece of clean data generated in a laboratory that can be easily subjected to statistical manipulations testing abstract models. Barclay maintains that a focus should be given a social action in the interactive setting (other work such as Bartlett, 1932/1995; Potter and Wetherell, 1987; Billig, 1990; Edwards and Potter, 1992; Harré and Gillet, 1994; Edwards, 1997). Thus, studies of remembering then demand a focus on naturally-occurring, everyday phenomena occasioned in social settings in contrast to idealised laboratory settings. Some examples of such studies include joint reconstruction of the past in anniversaries and commemorative exercises and rituals (Schwartz, Zerubavel et al., 1982; Ehrenhaus, 1989; Sturken, 1991; Norval, 1998), rhetorical organisation of remembering and forgetting in ordinary conversations (Edwards and Middleton, 1986; Billig, 1990; Wetherell and Potter, 1992; Wooffitt, 1992; Middleton, 1997), an image making process of political leaders (Schudson, 1990) and reconstruction of historical figures (Schwartz, 1990; 1996), workplace and institutional practice (Orr, 1990), folk explanations and narrative myths (Padden, 1990). This point applies to the present study, that is, reconciliation should be studied as a situated social and cultural practice, involving particular social relations, realised in a linguistic community. To study social organisation of the past—socially constituted processes and communicative actions of remembering, I adopt a discursive psychological approach, a movement to re-examine critically the method of doing psychology, its epistemological problem (Harré and Gillet, 1994).

In the following I will introduce some defining features of discursive psychological studies of memory in contrast to the orthodox psychological studies (i.e., cognitive, experimental studies). Specific questions to start with are: in what ways does a discursive approach that stresses social organisation of remembering challenge some of the traditional orthodox positions represented in the study of psychology? What are the fundamental assumptions of more traditional work in psychology which such an approach calls into question? The discursive psychologists, Edwards, Potter and Middleton (Edwards, Potter et al., 1992) question the very assumptions upon which the more traditional, social psychological approach to memory is based. Specifically, the assumption relates to reliability and verifiability of recalled event if they fit to a particular piece of reality. According to the relativist view of memory, there is no way to determine what took place in the past, which is not a version of that past. Here, however, I am not questioning whether or not some

historical events such as the holocaust had actually taken place. Rather, I emphasise that the way in which experienced or witnessed events were told would yield a possibility of multiple versions of the events. In other words, there are no independent criteria by which to determine the accuracy of account since the very criteria itself would simply constitute another account. The reflexive nature of the language is inherent in our accounting practices. Furthermore, since accounts accomplish rhetorical work in the circumstances of their use, that is, they generate implications and display present concerns, the very focus of investigation should be on what that situated work might be. The thesis will demonstrate how the discursive psychological perspective supports the position that memory and remembering entail the people's work of attending to the situated concerns that versions of past events make available. Furthermore, the rhetorical work accomplished with use of identity reveals the situated work of accountability as people address concerns regarding a particular version of the past that was made available interactionally.

I also discuss some ways social remembering enables people, groups and communities to conceive of their present. I will address the issue of how a particular version of past events holds significance for identity positions—the way that we conceive of who we are now. For instance, let us take the POW participants' interactional concern with claming their problems they had at the Japanese prisoner-of-war camp. The problems were brought to the fore, while attending to their identity positions as well as the recipient's. Identity is a key concept in analysing both talk and texts regarding reconciliation, apology, and compensation. We will see the situated use of identity descriptions, which would accomplish social actions of blaming, justifying, forgiving, and so forth. Also, the following questions are to be considered. How do different takes on past events enable different conceptions of the present? How does this relate to issues of moral culpability? What do different versions of the past imply for the legitimacy of claiming conciliatory position in a group of participants of different cultural and ethnic origin? How is this done in and through a story about the events? In considering these questions, I outline the following three features, that are relevant to discursive approach to remembering and reconciliation

Variability of recalled events

Issues stemming from these aforementioned studies relate to the handling of diversity and multiplicity of views, opinions, accounts, narratives, and descriptions of the

events and experiences. In the discursive approach, variability need not be a methodological hurdle for achieving generalisability, reliability and validity as in the experimental psychological research. On the contrary, variability exemplified in various versions of accounts of a problematic event, or opinions about it, works as a discursive resource for members as well for analysts. Variability is not treated as a noise nor outlier. Rather, it illustrates the social and action orientation to remembering and reconciliation. Discursive psychology suggests that variability, both across and within individual participants' conceptualisations and versions of thing, is best examined as a key phenomenon rather than removed by statistical procedures that result in a single, consistent, 'modal' response (Edwards, 1997). Hence, variability becomes a key analytical resource for discursive psychologists and discourse analysts (Potter and Wetherell, 1987; Edwards and Potter, 1992).

Ideological dilemmas in remembering and forgetting

Variability of accounts of recalled events are treated not only as a discursive resource, but also it enables us to examine the rhetorical nature of remembering. Middleton and Edwards identify ideological dilemmas in social remembering in relation to variability of memory:

> Variability does not have to be regarded as a mere methodological problem of how to establish the facticity of any person's account. It can become a resource for revealing the relationship between what people remember and the ideological dilemmas of their past and present socio-economic and political circumstance (Middleton and Edwards, 1990, p. 3).

Ideological dilemma is originated in Billig's work on rhetoric (Billig, Condor et al., 1988; Billig, 1996). He explains that in characterising variability in representation as 'argument', we are marking the relevance of previous discourse analytic work which shows talk and thinking to have a rhetorical or argumentative structure (Billig, 1996), and thus to embody contradictory or opposing views on its object (Billig, Condor et al., 1988). Drawing on this view of rhetorical organisation as a social remembering, Buchanan and Middleton in their re-examination of reminiscence practice, stress the wider implication to wider social issues. "[I]t is not merely considering consequence of variability, but a consideration of contradictory representations of reminiscence and reminiscence work, as a means of identifying their functions and consequences in relation to broader social issues" (Buchanan and Middleton, 1994, p. 63). Indeed, this view would apply to the current study on activities of reconciliation situated in the

discursive act of remembering as it brings to a fore the participants' orientation to wider social issues such as a shared, collective sense of the past and history.

The notion of ideological dilemmas help us identify people's use of cultural tools and mediated actions (Wertsch, 1985; Vygotsky, 1987; 1987; Cole, 1988; van der Veer and Valsiner, 1991; 1998) in social remembering. For example, Sturken (1997) examines the role of the image in producing both memory and amnesia, and both cultural memory and history. She notes that the relationship between the camera image to memory and history is contradictory. "For every image memory produced, something is forgotten" (Sturken, 1997, p. 2). The important point here is not what we remember and forget, but rather the circumstances in which a particular account (or an image in this case) is produced (or omitted). Therefore, memory is no neutral act or product of remembering and forgetting; it is shaped by the circumstances of memory production as well as motives and stake of people who are involved. We need to focus on this constitutive process in which those who have a particular stake and interests are engaged. A discursive act of remembering not only shapes and endorses a particular version of the past, but also claims its relevance and projects it to the future. Remembering, as well as forgetting, is a highly political social action, and the close examination of rhetorical structure of argumentation would illustrate and make visible people's ideological dilemmas at the level of their use in talk and texts. By way of ideological dilemma, people use contrastive categories in argument and apply them to particulars. In the thesis, the former POW participants, in conversation about their experience of reconciliation, make contentious comments about the past in question, claim their problems and engage themselves in disputes. The ways in which the participants manoeuvre these categories and accomplish these social actions are precisely the analytical focus for studying discursive reconciliation.

Truth, accuracy, and authenticity in social remembering

An approach to the study of remembering as a form of communicative practice is not one that simply emphasises social context, but is a greater degree more than a traditional approach. The distinguishing characteristic is much more fundamental than this, involving an approach to questions of accuracy that regards them as concerns that speakers have and not necessarily concerns which are relevant for the validity of an analysis of remembering itself. I address what gets done in conversational interaction in light of these issues. Thus, for example, I consider why Edwards and

Potter (Edwards and Potter, 1992; Edwards, Potter et al., 1992) find Neisser's approach theoretically inadequate despite Neisser's emphasis on actual conversational settings. Furthermore, discussing remembering as a form of communicative practice entails examining how speakers attend to issues of stake and interest, issue of meta cognition, etc. in the versions of past events they relate to one another. In what way do speakers attend to rhetorically significant concerns through the versions they employ in their talk? How do speakers attend to issues of stake and interest through their talk about past events? That is, how do they take the issue of participants' interest in having a particular version connected with past events being accepted itself as their own concern in the talk, and what do they accomplish by doing so?

These questions make a significant implication to veracity of memory, that is, a single truth representing a particular past does not exist somewhere out there, but it is constructed rhetorically through social interactions emerging in various discursive forms of talk and texts (Middleton and Edwards; Potter and Wetherell; Edwards and Potter). Barclay (1994) critically evaluates the traditional psychological method to studying memory:

> [M]uch of the dissatisfaction with a traditional approach to the study of memory has resulted from a concern for authenticity in the phenomena studied, which also raises questions about the broad generalizability of findings regarding the nature of memory beyond the highly controlled and decontexualized laboratory setting. (Barclay, 1994, p. 324)

Also, recent work in cultural and communication studies (e.g. Bromley, 1988; Zelizer, 1995) opposes the notion of correct, original or authentic memory:

> Remembering is as if you do film editing or album making of your own, involving cutting, editing, selecting and foregrounding and forgetting which are simultaneously 'personal' and the product of already existing cultural decisions shaped by the convention of 'biographical allegory'... Our concern is the product, and we must engage in the processes as a matter of cultural analysis, not the truth. (Bromley, 1988, p. 9)

Thus, remembering is an occasioned discursive practice where authenticity and truthfulness of the account, or how accurate the account is to the past events and actions that are not at issue. To elucidate this point further, Edwards and Potter (1992) re-examined Neisser's case study (Neisser, 1982) of John Dean's testimony to the Senate Watergate Committee (see also Middleton and Edwards, 1990; Edwards, Potter et al., 1992). They have argued that people's accounts of past events need to be examined as contexualised and variable productions that do pragmatic and rhetorical

work. They showed "how Dean's testimony is designed to accomplish authenticity and accountability, rather than being a man's best (but flawed) efforts at accurate recall" (Edwards, Potter & Middleton, p. 445). This view of person's memory entails that no one version can be taken as a person's real memory. They compare two forms of remembering, which occur in laboratories and in ordinary talk to see how a discursive approach would deal with verbatim recall and memory for gist. According to Edwards et al (1992), verbatim recall for experimentalists defines memory by its limitations. That is, accuracy of recall is measured by the ways in which the experimental conditions are adjusted. With the discursive approach, verbatim recall "emerges...as an option via which speakers may choose to display their remembering as veridical and authentic, and also to manage accountability and 'footing'; these are her words, not mine" (Edwards. Et al, 1992, p. 445). In Wooffitt's term (1992), direct quotations with the use of footing are considered as "a device that *warrants* accuracy...and attends to the speaker's reliability in the face of reporting doubtful events" (Edwards et al. 1992, p. 445). Similarly memory for 'gist' (Neisser, 1982; Neisser and Winograd, 1988) is defined in experimental studies as methodologically that the focus is on the semantic content such as a story's basic structure, script and propositions. By contrast, 'gist' can be studied as part of the discursive construction and pragmatic organisation and positioning of descriptions and reporting. It is not the experimenter's category and concerns, but participant's category, where relevance and accuracy are their business at hand (ibid.).

In studies of memory and social remembering, the notion of reminiscence can be viewed as one form of remembering by taking a discourse analytic approach. Buchanan and Middleton (1993; 1994) look at how 'reminiscence' as the object of inquiry is represented in the talk and writing of those involved in various ways with reminiscence work. They show "how an analysis of discourse about reminiscence can broaden our understanding of reminiscence work, and how it can throw new light on the 'evidence problem,' truthfulness of what was remembered" (1994, p. 63). Their interests are in the social relations, and they illustrate how the process of making social relations and order of the present interaction are resourced by the remembering of the particular past at issue. The talk about reconciliation, as a form of remembering, can be examined in terms of how the speakers display their positions regarding a particular version of the past and how those positions are claimed relative to a particular social relation and interactional setting. Furthermore, reconciliation,

from a cognitive perspective, would pose an essentialist question of whether your reconciliation experience is genuine. Authenticity and truthfulness of their reconciliation experience becomes a matter of our concern, which demands criteria for true and authentic reconciliation. On the contrary, the discursive approach would not speculate on an internal, mental state of reconciliation as what is produced discursively as to what reconciliation means to them and how it happened is a situated interactional work of remembering.

Remembering and accountability

In their discussion on accuracy and authenticity of memory, Edwards et al. (1992) suggest that remembering can be considered as work of accountability in which social action such as blaming, justifying, agreeing and the like are performed (Buttny, 1993). Accountability has been a major interest for discourse studies and other social science disciplines, especially ethnomethodology. Topics and settings range from ethnographic studies of tribal sense-making practices in an African community (Douglas, 1980), conversation analytic study of moral accountability in complaints and transgression (Drew, 1998), discourse of belonging (Shotter, 1993), discourse analysis of teachers accountability for their experience of stress (Hepburn and Brown, 2001); discourse analysis of media's accountability practices and construction of fact (MacMillan and Edwards, 1998); the study of reminiscence practice and its accountability for therapeutic benefits (Middleton and Buchanan, 1993). As can be seen, the topic of accountability is a widely studied and offers a promising direction to studies of social and cultural memory and collective remembering. The concept of accountability, as one of the two key themes of the thesis, has guided the analysis of talk and text data and highlighted the past as being constructed according to the stake and interests of the people who are engaged in remembering. In studying discursive reconciliation where people do reconciliation interactionally, how a particular past is remembered in a particular setting and established as the version of the past tease out the participants' orientation to accountability—legitimising and undermining versions of past. Social actions of blaming, forgiving, claiming culpability, apologising are part of such accountable actions.

Accounting practices

The study of discursive reconciliation is concerned with the people's accounting practices, in particular the ways in which the particular version of the past is socially constructed and is put to use to perform social actions. This is in line with the non-cognitive, social constructionist approach to studies of remembering and forgetting that focuses on "accounting practices" (Shotter, 1990; 1991). In the non-cognitive approach, our way of speaking becomes central, and therefore language and its use are the analytical focus, rather than seeing it as mental representation of cognitive experiences. In other words, discursive reconciliation does not presuppose a mental state, underlying the consciousness, which is somehow represented in discourse. We should look at the accounting practices in which people perform various social actions. This has a wider implication to the ways in which people are oriented to the social relations and social order of the particular society, or community that become at issue. Shotter elaborates on the social nature of the accounting practices in remembering as follows:

> [O]ur way of talking about our experiences work, not primarily to represent the nature of those experiences in themselves, but to represent them in such a way as to promote one or another kind of social order. ...[W]hat is remembered and the manner of its recall must be such as to help reproduce a society's social order. (Shotter, 1990, p. 123)

He goes on to explain that:

> [A]n account is not simply a description of an action, which by the provision of evidence could be proved true or false, but it works as an aid to perception, literally instructing one both in how to see something as a commonplace event, and, in so seeing it, appreciating the opportunities it offers for one's own further action. (Shotter, 1991, p. 28)

By accounting practices, it is primarily concerned with our ways of talking in order "to co-ordinate diverse social action; to create, maintain, reproduce and transform certain modes of social and societal relationships" (Shotter, 1990, p. 121).

Memory and intersubjectivity

If memory, or remembering, is social and discursive, what is the significance of people's subjectivity? How do people make individual perceptions, experiences, and views and opinions available to others? To answer these questions, language seems to play a major role here. People talk about idiosyncratic, highly personal and individual

experiences and views. Often people use meta-cognitive words to mark out and describe the individual, unique and personal experiences. According to Wittgenstein, words such as 'remember' and 'forget', which psychologists may take to label private mental processes, are best analysed in terms of their public uses. This focus on public uses is not a matter of denying the existence of inner mental processes. Rather, "what we deny is that the picture of the inner process gives us the correct idea of the use of the work 'to remember'" (Wittgenstein, 1968 (1958), §305). The way words such as 'remember' are used, and the common-sense assumptions that go with it, are available for analysis as public practices. The issue then is translated into what people are doing when they talk like this. The topic for investigation becomes "the intersubjective conventions and constraints in the ratification of the ascription of such predicates by self and or other" (Coulter, 1985, p. 129). Research on talk and interaction argues that people establish what psychologists term "intersubjectivity" through talk (e.g. Wooffitt, 1992; Gupta, 1996). These studies shed a new insight as to how discursive studies contribute to developing our understanding of memory and remembering. The present study of discursive reconciliation benefits from this approach to remembering. The participants produced a number of narrative accounts of the past in the interview talk. The discourse analysis of the narrative shows the participants' common-sense assumptions of, and a shared sense of, what it is to be reconciled with a troubling past. Thus reconciliation can be studied in the social act of remembering, because it is not within the individual, but it is in the public domain of intersubjectivity realised in discourse.

The notion of intersubjectivity of memory and remembering has been studied in contrast to the individualistic approach to memory in a number of everyday settings. For instance, a developmental psychological work explored the children's development of language by examining mother-child joint-construction of memory. Gupta (1996) suggests that the social constructionist approach may yield better theoretical models of the relationship between the person and his/her social-cultural environment. Although she recognises the importance of looking at the individual features of memory processes, the social constructionist approach would considerably contribute to "understanding the emergence of the remembering act as an on-going construction and organisation of an inherently social existence" (Gupta, 1996). In a similar vein, sociological research on memory emphasises that memory is a social intersubjective phenomenon" (Zerubavel, 1996, p. 297). Alternatively,

intersubjectivity can be understood as establishing shared understanding of the topic at issue. Studies of conversational remembering inform us there is a link between establishing intersubjectivity and shared understanding of the past (e.g. Boden, 1983; Edwards and Middleton, 1986; Mercer, 2000). These studies examine ordinary conversations and demonstrate the ways in which participants collaboratively achieve meaning, identity and even power in face-to-face conversations (Boden, 1983). They "reproduce historically and interactionally situated social action" (Boden, 1993, p. 86). The talk about reconciliation then highlights a non-static, ever-changing nature of meaning making process in terms of intersubjectivity. It shows how the participants' view of the past and shared understanding of it is constructed in talk.

What follows is a review of literature and its discussion relating to specific issues taken up for analysis of the discourse examples (i.e., texts and talk). The literature selected has a direct relevance to the key analytical issues explored in the analytical chapters of the thesis. The discussion will outline the theoretical basis for pursuing analytical issues, which would as a result, apply a sharper focus to the studies of social practices of reconciliation in terms of identity and accountability.

Interdisciplinary approach to psychological study of identity

According to cultural and discursive psychologists, narrative and histories are the key component to the formation of identity. Drawing on sociocultural and discursive approach (e.g. Wertsch, 1987; Edwards, 1997; Rowe, Kosyaeva et al., In press), I now discuss why identity is a key empirical issue in studying remembering and reconciliation There is a proliferation of psychological research on identity and its formation with a diverse approach. Cultural-historical psychologists, Bruner (1990a; 1990b) and Wertsch (1987) propose an interdisciplinary approach to psychological study of identity through examination of narrative. Wertsch points out that psychology studies of memory has not attended to a set of assumptions about psychological processes as to how history shapes national identity and political action are grounded in such processes. His proposal for the interdisciplinary approach is based on the notion of 'mediated action' in cultural-historical psychology (Vygotsky, 1978; Vygotsky, 1987). Human mental functioning (such as knowing, thinking, remembering, etc.) and human action involve the use of 'mediated actions,' or 'cultural tools':

> [I]n trying to understand mediated action it is essential to recognise the power of cultural tools to shape such action, on the one hand, but it is equally essential to recognise the role of activity agents who use these cultural tools, on the other. (Wertsch, 1987, p. 20)

Drawing on Vygotsky's insights about semiotic mediation and interpsychological functioning (Wertsch, 1987, p. 20), Wertsch stresses context embeddedness of memory, and therefore proposes a focus on sociohistorical and cultural embeddedness to specify mediational means at work. He extends the concept of mediated means as more than tangible and observable. He states that Vygotsky touched on a variety of items in his analysis of the tools that mediate human activity, ranging from the relatively simple external artefacts (e.g., tying a knot in a handkerchief to remind oneself of something) to complex aesthetic patterns of inner speech. These tools appear "in the form of complex verbal texts, in particular, sociohistorically evolved descriptions and explanations of events" (p. 20). In a simpler term, studying human memory and remembering as a situated cognition, one needs to focus on language.

Wertsch explains that human actions are socioculturally situated since people are always in a position of using cultural tools, which have been produced by a particular set of historical, institutional and cultural forces. One of the functions of history, especially the official histories, gives the citizens with some sense of group identity as a nation, as local community or neighbourhood. Also, there is an identity forming process, as Wertsch (1997) adopts from Lowenthal (1985) in production of narratives. Narratives and story telling are then considered as a device for the formation and maintenance of identity. Like many other social constructionist scholars, he takes a broad notion of narrative ranging from the annals and chronicles containing chronological events to history textbooks, consisting of accounts of nation-state and of nationalistic histories with selected truth for posterity (FitzGerald, 1979).

Narrative seems to be a potent material to look at ways in which the personal identity is discursively organised in relationship to the collective identity or national history. There is a whole separate field called narrative analysis (e.g. Bruner, 1990; Labov in Cortazzi, 1993) that embraces a structuralist analytic tradition. It looks at a theme, a plot and its structure and narrative voice. In this thesis, instead of using the pre-determined structure to understand the relationship between personal identity and collective identity and history, we will make use of the discursive approach to narrative to examine the use of identity in both collective and personal sense. It illustrates how the notion of change is invoked in the telling of narratives.

Cultural tools for establishing an identity: Outsider narratives and dislocation

Cultural tools are resourceful for establishment of identity. For this, one may be tempted to rely on a traditional schema of identity—an ethnic identity or a rather conventional sense of nationality. It appears, however, such schema is an obsolete notion because much of contemporary research asserts that national, ethnic, or cultural boundaries have become increasingly blurry and that identities in contemporary societies are characterised with properties of fragmentation and fluidity. Identity may be understood as a sense of belonging to "imagined" communities (e.g., nation, social institution, community, family, interest groups) (Anderson, 1983). Proponents of social constructionism and discursive psychology (e.g., Middleton and Edwards, 1990; Zerubavel, 1996; Wertsch, 1997; Schwartz, 1999) suggest that memory and the sense of belonging are examined as being located in particular cultural forms such as life stories, autobiography, and autobiographical fiction. Schwartz recognises that "the link between research and autobiography appears through 'sociological introspection' (Ellis 1991, 1993 in Schwartz): deliberate self-dialogue to determine how public events are privately processed and become objects of moral commitment and identity." Among these cultural forms, outsider narratives (e.g., by immigrants, exiles, marginals, deviants, and expatriates) seem to illustrate more clearly an awareness of self and others, or "the dialogue between 'ourselves' and 'others'" (Middleton, 1991). Such cultural forms are produced from a position of "not belonging" and therefore the outsider narratives highlight the notions of loss, dislocation and displacement with respect to identity formation. This can be considered in terms of how a person positions him/herself with awareness of cultural others in a cross-cultural interactional setting. In discursive reconciliation, cultural otherness is made by British former POW's a participants' concern, as they spoke of their experience of the reconciliation trip to the Japanese interviewer.

The current research looks at the discursive construction of cultural otherness in the participants' narratives, which account for displacement and dislocation, or claims his/her own failure of cultural adjustment. Such narratives offer a way to get access to the significance of the past where history as collective memory and identity as personal/private memory are inter-woven and situated in a particular social setting. In addition, the examination of identity unravels the performative nature of identity and illustrate a way in which discursive mobilisation of identity works as a resource

in their talk about reconciliation experiences. The study seeks to examine the very issue of construction of cultural otherness in interaction. Here participants manage their stake and interest in accordance to identity positions and moral order being worked up in a particular social setting. The core issue in this research is termed as "managing sensitivity," referring to the idea as to the rhetorical orientation of the participants in remembering a problematic past (e.g., experiences of violence such as captivity and atrocities) with respect to the notion of cultural otherness.

History, memory and identity displacement

Cultural-historical psychologists and sociologists find that there is a cogent link between history and collective memory, and identity and personal memory. A notion of nation specific collective memory may urge a question of how history is used by the people in the process of making collective memory. Also, the discussion so far has identified an important relationship between history and collective memory. I now address the relevance of studying identity in the scope of collective/public and private/personal memory. Treating history as records of collective memory, the following analogy might give a helpful start:

> history is to the nation rather as memory is to the individual. As an individual deprived of memory becomes disoriented and lost, not knowing whether he has been or where he is going, so a nation denied a conception of its past will be disabled in dealing with its present and its future. As the means for defining national identity, history becomes a means for shaping history. (Schelesinger, 1992, pp. 45-6)

The argument seems to be that history is a tool for establishing national identity through collective memory, there should be a cultural tool for establishing an identity for the individual. I emphasise that these distinctions are mobilised as analyst's categories as a result of their own abstraction and idealisation, which are presumptive and tendentious to validate their findings and conclusions. In the discursive approach, we would not assume these notions are constructs and used for classification purposes.

History as a moral narrative

In the case study of US and Japan national perspectives on history, White (1997) argues that "history in public sphere is always to some degree mythic history, a form of moral narrative representing collective interest and identities" (p. 63). He develops

the concept of 'mythic history' as a way of analysing the discursive means through which public histories create social and emotional meaning (White, 1997). It is a case study of how historical practices used to represent and commemorate the national war. White looks at a setting and a recent occasion that marked an particularly crucial moment of history in American memorisation of war—50th anniversary of the Japanese bombing of Pearl Harbor that brought the United States into war. He examines the functions of mythic narrative in conceptualising and institutionalising national memory with particular focus of tensions that emerged in media commentary generated by the anniversary, then proceeds to the analysis of the national commemorative ceremonies held at Pearl Harbor (1997, p. 64). Reflecting on this point concerning societal tensions in the presentation of mythic narratives raises questions concerning how sentiment, emotion and moral commitment are made significant in the talk about reconciliation. The discursive psychological perspective treats such narratives as an analytic resource to investigate the participants' use to accomplish accountability of social actions. The starting point of inquiry amounts to this question—what are the issues and concerns that make acts of remembering a culturally significant and emotionally moving and morally compelling activity? White observes that the cliché phrase of 'Remember Pearl Harbor' having quickly become part of American's repertoire of historic war cries. Thus Pearl Harbor is, in his term, "the Pacific War event most etched in collective memory through its visual iconography (White, pp. 67-8). The slogan such as this is a powerful rhetorical trope and would provide for the discourse analysis to underpin the rhetorical organisation of ideological dilemma and discursive use of identity.

Cross-cultural comparison on war memory

Another comparative study on national memory of WWII, that was conducted between Germany and Japan (Buruma, 1994), adds to the present discussion on identity, narrative, emotion, and moral commitment. Central to Buruma's work is a more general question of how two nations, having lost the WWII, handled their own past with regard to their accountability of the loss and infamous atrocities committed to the other countries, and how such accountability is manifested as collective guilt and shame. Buruma's approach is qualitative, investigative, and journalistic; he gathered accounts mainly from conversations with political and intellectual figures and observations based on films, books and other cultural forms. He emphasises that

two societies have taken different paths to treat, use, and formulate national memory. Another main analytical interest is how Germans and Japanese have dealt with the problems pertaining to shame and guilt derived from the WWII. For instance, in the chapter titled "memorials, museums and monuments," he examines Germany's case of *Mahnmal*, a "monument of warning." Unlike the Great War monument, which was to mystify the war with valor, sacrifice, and regeneration, the Mahnmal was built not to glorify WWII, but to warn (Buruma, 1994, p. 202). The monument of warning goes beyond pointing out Germany's problem of anti-semitism, but also "suggest more abstract...shameful memories which cannot be repressed, claws their way into our conscience, like a constantly recurring nightmare" (ibis, p. 203).

In contrast to Germany's treatment of the war in commemorative practices, Japan has a discernible absence of WWII memorials, monuments and museums, except one museum of the Yasukuni Shrine in Tokyo. This is the only official site dealing with the history of the entire war (Buruma, 1994). The shrine embodies Japan's self-sacrifice and loyalty to the emperor and the country. Buruma surveyed around Japan, looking for monuments and accounts that were not championed in the officially approved form presented in museums and shrines. Although Buruma's accounts and narratives are a product of 'his' construction, his work does give us insight and a more specific idea about how to get access to cultural processes and forms upon which war memories are contingent. Through identifying the commonalties and differences between two societies' experiences, memory is considered as a cultural process. It is presented with a blend of diversity of voices in which members of the society make sense of the war and consistency as to how society at large moves on in its aftermath. As a result, Buruma's work inspired the survey-based study on collective memories of German and Japanese cohorts (Schuman, Akiyama et al., 1998).

Other studies using large sample survey of public memory were conducted by Scott and Zac (1993). Their work investigated the events and changes that the British and American public regard as important. Also, a survey based study on collective memories about the past half-century using Germans and Japanese cohorts (Schuman, Akiyama et al., 1998) replicates the findings drawn from predecessors (Schuman and Scott, 1989). These studies tested a hypothesis developed by Mannheim, the idea of a political generation: that historical events that happen in people's formative years leave a permanent imprint on people's memories (Mannheim 1928/1952 in Scott and

Zac, p. 316; Schuman et al, 1998). The significance of formative years in imprinting on people's memory is consistent with Schwartz' observation of his war time childhood experience. Unlike British and European cohorts showing that some events were chosen specific to age, American cohort lacked such a link. The age as to when people experience the war, especially studying the war veterans, appears to be significant. Developmental change or life span study of memory over the years as well as gerontological work attending to remembering of past events can be an informative in initial framing of a conceptual range of the thesis.

The large sample based survey with cross-cultural comparison provides a coherent idea of how particular historical events are translated into collective and national memory. However, it seems that conclusions in cross-cultural comparative studies simply re-produce and re-affirm our common-sense understanding of cultural differences. The relevance of this work is that rather than treating such issues as independent variables (e.g., age, culture and ethnic background) as pre-given categories, they need to be examined as discursively mobilised and worked up categories. We can see how these categories are formulated and resources the on-going circumstances of talk. Historical events are often pivotal to participants' act of remembering as they prompt further telling of a particular topic or events being recalled. At the same time, the further telling is made relevant to participants' concerns and topic under discussion. Similarly, the POW participants' talk about reconciliation is resourced by their lived experiences in the historical events. In the telling of significance of historical events, participants' categories of ethnicity and cultural origin are invoked as relevant in a trajectory of the reconciliation talk.

Accounting for others: Cultural otherness

The previous section provided a brief discussion as to how society at large—Japan, US, and Germany handled the consequences of WWII and how people position themselves with various aspects of the war. I would not deny that there are dimensions of cultural and national specificity of war memories. However, I raise a concern with the way in which cultural dimension is studied in memory research as such. Rather than treating culture and cross-cultural issues as variable of the causal model or explanations, culture itself is a topic in its own right in people's accounting practices (Edwards, 1995; 1997). The current study adopts this view and asks how the POW participants and the interviewer, coming from different cultural backgrounds,

take cross-cultural issues—ethnic and racial differences and similarities as a topic in its own right in accounting for their past experiences. How do they attend to so-called cultural otherness? How is cultural otherness formulated in talk and put to use to perform a particular social action? Studies of cultural otherness in remembering, as a principal analytical concern, beg a question of how cultural others are remembered within the present context of interview on reconciliation experiences. How do the participants produce their account of experiences with cultural others attending to a relevance to a particular past as well as to the present interactional circumstances?

Indeed, cross-cultural comparison between large cohorts may be a strategy to go about studying collective memory at work as in Schuman et al's study (1998). It is worth noting that each culture, society or community has a way of accounting the war events, not just accounting a particular aspect. This way of accounting can be referred to ideological dilemmas to which people in a particular cultural community or society seem to be oriented.

Accounting for the past

Time and place in remembering

The discursive approach to the social organisation of remembering raises the importance of considering the concept of time and place, specifically ways in which the past, present and future are discursively formulated and linked together (e.g., marking of time and place in identity construction). "Our modes of being and doing are cultural products that constitute a guiding constraint concerning what form our present and future actions should and could take" (Middleton, 1987, p. 2). The concept of time and place is counter-intuitive to our common sense understanding of linear time especially from the narratological standpoint. For instance, temporal order is often subverted in people's narratives. This is drawn on the consideration of the function of language, the way people use language to locate a particular event or experience as well as identity in a particular time and place. A few studies have looked at the concept of time in terms of a distinction between tense and aspect. Le Goff (1992) notes that all human languages are not equipped with the same way of marking time. The evidences come from looking at other languages and how different tenses are used to mark (and not to mark) the notion of past, present and future. Whereas English has a clear distinction of marking past, present, and future, some

other languages such as Arabic, German (and also Japanese and Chinese) do not mark it as clearly as English does. These other languages have a clearer distinction of aspect, "perfective" and "imperfective," that is whether an action or event at issue is complete or not.

Assmann (1999) developed this concept by illustrating the ways in which the collective past of the dynasty in ancient Egypt has been narrated. In discussing a distinction of what he calls "history and anti-history," he notes a general absence of history in Egypt, namely historical narrative and consciousness. He argues this has a bearing on the Egyptian construction of time and identity. The Egyptians imagined time as a cyclical phenomenon in a sense that they were convinced to have to "cyclicize" time by means of cultural efforts, in order to enable time and the world to continuously regenerate itself and to prevent it from running into chaos. Cyclical time is a cultural form that has to be constructed and maintained by a meticulous observance of rites and feasts

Furthermore, Assmann (1999) states that "history" is generated by the communicational needs and occasions for representing the past that has no form and structure of its own. This implies that "time passing has no linear or historical structure of its own and that any such structure must be culturally generated" (Assmann, 1999, p. 3). The tomb in ancient Egypt provides an example for an explanation that the tomb was the place of history as a way of thinking time in terms of aspect, instead of tense. He elaborates this point as follows:

> [T]he tomb was for the Egyptian a vantage point from which to overlook his life in its entirely as an accomplished result and not as an ongoing process. Egyptian language incorporated a construction of time that was not based on three tenses—past, present and future, but on the distinction of aspects—perfective and imperfective. The imperfective aspect sees an event or action from within, as an ongoing motion, whereas the perfective aspect sees it from without (i.e., outside), as a finished form. In this view, time is conceived of endless repetition in terms of the aspect or time from within, and of changeless duration, this is the perfective aspect of time looked at from without (outside). The tomb, for the Egyptian, serves as a place to look at his life from without" (Assmann, 1999, p. 4).

The Egyptian seems to have learned to view his life both from within, as long as it is, and from without, as what it will have been. At the same time, history, historical thinking and consciousness presuppose the capacity to see life in the perfective aspect as in a meaningful form. To see one's life in the perfective aspect requires a form of self-distinction and even self-historicization. The tomb is the place

of account-giving for these purposes. Here, a human life is represented in a series of scenes and inscriptions as the accomplished result of his earthly activities and virtues. "The biographical inscriptions in private tombs are the only Egyptian texts that communicate a longer stretch of history and reconstruct the past at least for the extension of a life-time" (Assmann, p. 4). It seems that the Egyptian concept of time—history and anti-history or view within and without (or outside)—gives rise to a reflexive nature of our practices of memory and remembering. This also re-addresses Zelizer's argument of time and place in remembering. It provides further conceptual framework to Boden's argument on time, "past elaborating the present" in ordinary talk of the elderly (Boden, 1983).

Time and place: discursive vs. non-discursive

In understanding the socially constitutive nature of remembering, it is important to re-visit the conception of time. Conventionally, we think of time in conflation of the past, present and future as time flows in one direction. The current research expands this conventional conception of time and identifies evidence of talk in which the linear concept of time is subverted and the chronological and temporal order of historical events and personal experiences become less relevant. This notion of time reaffirms that remembering is a social activity in which on-going construction and organisation of the past are accomplished. Hence, memory has physical properties as well temporal. These physical properties are evident in non-discursive materials such as memorials, monuments and various artefacts used for commemoration (e.g., Anderson, 1983; Young, 1989; Sturken, 1991; 1993; Buruma, 1994). In research on Holocaust memorials and meaning (Young, 1993), he argues that that memorials not only represent people's experiences at the period of Holocaust, but also they become the sites to remember the past according to the variety of national myths, ideals, and political needs. They reflect both the past experiences and current lives of their communities as well as state memories (Young, 1993). If time and place are used to mark continuity of their identity, existence, and succession of the past, then how is change marked and accounted for? In the next section I will discuss the way people account for change.

Accounting for change: Change and continuity in social remembering

The discussion of temporal and physical properties of memory has addressed the importance of the way in which people claim their identities in relation to time and place of their existence in a collective sense. History accounts for change as well as continuity (e.g., Buchanan and Middleton, 1995; Middleton and Hewitt, 1999; Taylor and Wetherell, 1999). How then do people account for change in interactional settings in the act of social remembering? In this section, I focus on narrative as one of the vehicles for remembering and describe its role in social and organisational remembering. One of the most universal characteristics of our social life is we talk about our experiences and our ability to tell stories. Oral historians seem to explore this concern as their main enterprise. People not only tell stories, but also claim their experiences in the form of "experience narrative" (Schrager, 1983). Also in Bruner's term (1990a; 1990b), the notion refers to narrative construction of reality.

A discursive analysis of storytelling or narrativisation provides for a way of understanding the social role of narratives in our lives. According to Benjamin (1970), story telling involves "the ability to exchange experiences" (p. 83). In addressing characteristics of this dying practice in modern times, he characterises that the story telling practice consists of three useful aspects — moral order, practical advice, and a proverb or maxim. "In every case the story teller is a man who has counsel for his readers" (p. 86). "The story teller takes what he tells from experience—his own or that reported by others. And he in turn makes it the experience of those who are listening to his tale." (p. 87). Hence, story telling is dialogic and involves making morality of the experience in the way the teller and the listeners understand. In a dialogic process of storytelling, how is moral sensibility attributed to a historical event? The following example illustrates how change is experienced in moral narratives as collective memory and history.

Narrative as moral accountability

Pearl Harbor is a portentous war event for many Americans when it comes to WWII against Japan, and it tends to trigger mixed emotions toward the Japanese. However, the significance of Pearl Harbor varies depending on the person who expresses it, the generation he or she belongs to, and cultural background at the time of the event and how they learned about it. White (1997) sought to examine cross-generational changes of the collective representation and lived experience regarding the varying

degrees of the ways in which Pearl Harbor is remembered. He describes the changes as "the synchronic variability" and the fluid nature of "diachronic processes of historical transformation and generational change" (White, 1997, p. 69). He was particularly interested in how Pearl Harbor memory is changing as it moves from lived memory (as spoken voice of Pearl Harbor survivors) to collective representation. Taking the case of 50th anniversary of Pearl Harbor, he concludes that it brings about public history as moral narratives and a consequential relationship to the issue of apology as a re-created social reality (White, 1997).

This study raises a set of important discourse analytic issues that are employed in this thesis. One is related to the politics of memory and its consequences. The anniversary and other official commemorative events are motivated by objectives defined by the state, namely the political interests and aims of those who host the events. People's participation in the events and their emotional involvement are in response to the positions represented by the state. The participation and emotional involvement often take their shape of expressing strong views, and manifested in strong protest against the host as well as support for the event. Similarly, the British POWs' protests and demand for apology and reparation from the government for its responsibility for war is a case in point in which politics of memory and history as moral narrative are central to the international diplomacy. White raises this issue in the ways in which blame and responsibility of the Pearl Harbor attack were formulated and resourced in the war memory, which was contributed by the bear witness and survivors of the attack (1997). The politics of remembering thus are manifested in the formulation of blames and responsibility and demand for apology. As Goffman notes that morality is a social institution (Goffman, 1983), not the individual property. The discursive business of blamings and demand for apology are understood as social actions, and therefore, can be studied in terms of moral accountability of the past war events.

Public and private memory

Traditionally, psychological research tends to take the categories of public and private memories for granted as if psychological constructs without having to scrutinise its categorical criteria. In experimental reductionist approach to memory, the dichotomy of public and private is appropriate and might be a useful conceptual framework in designing its studies since the approach is to explicate the mental states and its

representation, and its underpinning causal mechanism to link the inner and the outer. In the discursive psychological approach, the dichotomy of the public and the private is not clear-cut and is not transparent and self-evident. This dichotomy poses theoretical and methodological problems. With this concept of division, the researcher ends up devoting their efforts to resolve the tension between the two in order to produce a unified conceptual model of memory, in terms of what memory is produced and how memory processes work.

In the previous example of Pearl Harbor, moral narratives are people's discursive practices of collective remembering. Moral narratives are not representations of the individual attitude and value judgements, but they are in the public domain. Discursive practices, for example, demand for apology in the form of protests, produce the community's moral narrative. Sturken (1991) reports her observation as a similar phenomenon to this. She is concerned with how certain narratives of the war have been constructed out of and within the fluid realm of cultural memory, in which personal memories are shared for different purposes. Her study examines how the screen of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial "acts to eclipse personal and collective memories of the war from the design of history, and yet how the textures of cultural and personal memory are nevertheless woven throughout, perhaps over and under, these screens" (Sturken, 1991, p. 119). As we can see, many scholars coin the terms such as contradiction or tension to describe this duality of public and private memory and remembering.

Interdependencies of individual and collective remembering

Middleton has approached this problem of dualism in terms of "interdependencies of shared and personal meanings" (1997). In his studies of how members of a medical team would handle uncertainties, he argues:

> [I]nterdependencies between personal knowledge claims and their collective relevance is central... Nor are such interdependencies fixed; that are part of communicatively working up what uncertainties are currently relevant and how these relate to differential states of knowledge. In this way, the social organisation of remembering and forgetting is accomplished as part of social reasoning concerning uncertainties in the organisation, outcomes, and values of team-based practice (Middleton, 1997, pp. 407-8).

The view is shared by Gupta, who points out that such a separation would fail to "capture the interdependencies and complexity of the individual <-> social relationship" (1996, p. 3). Gupta's argument is that the examination of ways in which "their mutual relatedness is organised" (ibid., p. 2) is a more effective research focus (c.f., Valsiner, 1994). Thus, our analytic endeavour is to make such interdependencies visible as "the province of participants in memory work." Moreover, they constitute a conceptual tool for analysts understanding the social organisation of remembering and forgetting (Middleton and Edwards, 1990). This can be demonstrated in the way displays of remembering and forgetting are made relevant by participants themselves in their knowledge claims. An important feature of such displays is the way they are accomplished in terms of variably locating claims to knowledge of past events, issues, and experience as personal and/or collective.

Discursive approach to reconciliation

Reconciliation is a ubiquitous social phenomenon, woven into a fabric of social lives. It ranges from inter-personal relationships at our immediate environment of home, school, neighbourhood, and local communities, to a wider social context of business, economics, politics, government, international relations and diplomacy, and a spiritual area of philosophy and religion. The common thread in these areas is that reconciliation is a social practice that deals with differences of opinions, views and positions. It refers to a process that resolves differences, and as a result achieves harmony, unity or oneness of the community who are involved. In our common-sense understanding of the terms, it refers a state of mind, the psychological state, which includes individual's management of human emotions such as anger and frustrations which are closely connected to conflict of ideas, values, opinions and positions by perceived differences in others in a given social relation. In this section, I would like to re-examine this commonsensical understanding of what it is to be reconciled. Taking the discursive approach, I evaluate a current, dominant view of reconciliation represented in a selection of literature on moral and epistemological philosophy and politics and international relations. I highlight key features and fundamental assumptions of the current view of reconciliation that has been examined in people's reconciliatory activities in war and various other ethnic and race-related conflicts. A comparison between the dominant position and the discursive approach in the context

of studying social organisation of the past enables us to set up an overall argument of the thesis.

Reconciliation is one of Hegel's major philosophical projects regarding our political and personal concerns. Hardimon (1994) notes that a felt sense of division and conflict is a pervasive feature in the present-day European and North American societies where many people feel 'split' from their institutions as well as within themselves. He describes the split in two terms. The first one comes from institutions, and it is affected by their view of an institution as foreign, bifurcating and hostile or indifferent to their need. Another sense of split results from being divided by the conflicting aims or realising their individuality and being members of the community. I refer to this philosophical inquiry on reconciliation because it seems to provide some overarching concern in looking at various forms of social practices of reconciliation. In his exposition of Hegel's concept of reconciliation, Hardimon defines "[T]he word 'reconciliation', as it is ordinarily used, is systematically ambiguous as between the *process* of reconciliation and the *state* of that is its result" (p. 85, the emphasis is original). The process that Hardimon refers to may be explored in terms of overcoming conflict, division, enmity, alienation, or estrangement; the result, as to the restoration of harmony, unity, peace, friendship or love (ibid.). This concept of reconciliation is ubiquitous in everyday lives. We often hear and tell stories in which two parties begin as friends, become estranged, and become friends again. Hegel's concept of reconciliation is basically a dialectic process or a pattern, the unity, division and reunification and its transformation.

This concept of reconciliation seems to resemble our concern with psychological dualism of the individual vs. the social, when attempting to locate the cognitive process either in "inner" as in mental state or "outer" as in public domain. This thesis argues that the concept of reconciliation would merit a re-examination and analysis from a discursive approach. It brings the analytic focus to the terrain of people's social practices of reconciliation, not couched in the philosopher's armchair, nor in the contamination-free laboratory environment. The examination does not methodologically rely on logical reasoning nor on psychologist's categorisation and abstraction based on their own analytical categories and methods that endorse them self-referentially. In what follows I will introduce a line of work representing the orthodox psychology's take on this issue. I will articulate their strategy and assumptions in order to evaluate their contributions to understanding the concept and

social practices of reconciliation. I will assess specifically what has been studied and how the enquiry has carried on. Lastly, I will identify the distinction from the discursive psychological view and present the overall argument of the thesis.

Reconciliation as mental process?

Examination of literature on social practices of reconciliation, conflict resolution, international relations and peace studies informs a popular view on reconciliation that has been developed by adopting a cognitive-psychological model of reconciliation process and state (Retzinger, 1991; Tavuchis, 1991; Vangelisti, 1992; Krondorfer, 1995; Asmal, Asmal et al., 1997; Norval, 1998; Brecke and Long, 1999; Coleman, 1999; Green and Ahmed, 1999; Tutu, 1999; Swartz and Drennan, 2000). These studies are commonly concerned with accounting for causality and its mechanism of reconciliation by looking at what leads to current conflict and how such conflict can be resolved. In other words, they seem to assume there is an inner model at work—the causal relation and its mechanism in the human mind. Such research calls for a theoretical model that is scientifically accountable and reliable for replication. For example, the study by Brecke and Long (1999) articulates this cognitive view of reconciliation and offers a scientifically-replicable portrait of the impact of reconciliation. Despite the confounding conclusions, their discussion recommends further investigation of an important factor in improving relations between former belligerents (ibid.). They maintain that the investigation would give rise to "reconciliation in international politics and a theoretically-informed search for the mechanism by which reconciliation leads to a subsequent improvement in bilateral relations" (Brecke and Long, 1999, p. 113).

Forgiveness and apology as social action

The discussion as to what constitutes forgiveness and how it is achieved has direct implications to studies of reconciliation. From the discursive psychological standpoint, forgiveness is a social action involving moral accountability. How is the perception of the other (i.e., former perpetrator, aggressor, or offender) re-formulated in the act of forgiveness? This is fundamentally a social process as it takes the other to forgive the past wrongdoings in the first place. Existing research and accounts on reconciliation (e.g. Tavuchis, 1991; Tutu, 1999; Takaku, Weiner et al., 2001) conceive forgiveness in terms of the individual management of emotion, as

overcoming collective emotions (presumably negative and indignant), regaining of one's confidence and self-esteem, repudiation of emotions of resentment and willingness to see the other as someone other than "the one that hurt me."

Similarly, apology can be studied as the discursive practice of moral accountability, as it involves analytic concerns with the formulation of blame and responsibility, and the identification of speech acts and other pragmatics with focusing on a particular social and cultural context (Abado, 1990; Ide, 1998; Murata, 1998; Obeng, 1999; Retzinger, 1992; Takaku, 2000; Takaku, Weiner et al., 2001; Tavuchis, 1991; Trosborg, 1987; Vangelisti, 1992). An example of comprehensive work on sociology of apology is conducted by Tavuchis (1991), which provides a detail analysis of how apology functions in social interaction. The issues covered include the power of apology to mend social relationships, the composition of apologetic discourse, the distinctions between apology and other similar speech acts (e.g., excuses, justifications, etc.) and the association between apology and forgiveness. According to Tavuchis (1991), "the heart of an apology consists of a speech act that responds to a compelling call about something that can neither be forgotten nor forsaken" (p. 34). He asserts that apology has certain structural characteristics—"the joint acknowledgement of social norms and the wilful violation of one or more of those norms" (Vangelisti, 1992). These structural characteristics help define both the offender and the offended as members of the same moral community, but also allow the offended to call for an apology and the offender to exchange an apology for reconciliation. Furthermore, these characteristics of the speech act of apology demands a further examination of the affective, experimental dimensions of apology. For example, the felt sorrow influences the offender's receptivity to calls for apology as well as the likelihood that he or she will actually apologise. As with much other reconciliation research, Tavuchis' proposal and recommendation draw on these cognitive psychological assumptions that there is a causal mechanism or a black box explanation of input and output relations for predicting and generating a successful outcome of reconciliation. It is evident that a few examples introduced provide portrayals of the intricate relation between apology and forgiveness.

Like reconciliation, apology entails the descriptions of the behaviours, emotions, and normative rules that govern apologetic discourse. Tavuchis' research offers a number of issues that researchers might pursue, including cross-cultural

differences in apology and the pedagogy of apologetic practices. Clearly, the popular view supports a particular approach with which reconciliation and apology as ubiquitous influential social process is studied by looking at management of emotions, change of attitude or perception of other, and social harmony to achieve. However, these studies also address problems in applying their findings and suggesting plausible measures to improve relations between former belligerents, and victims and offenders. The problems include inconclusive support for the suggestion that reconciliation may lead to an improvement of relations, and some variance on the dependent variable. Precisely, the problems typify the variability issue that cognitive experimental studies encounter to resolve. Another problem, being methodological, is to do with the complex, multiple determinants of social phenomenon and spurious or invalid inferences drawn from a few cases where multiple causal factors may be at play. As part of the solutions to these problems, they seek to create a model that works universally across cultures. I argue that the proposal to create a universal model would be highly unrealistic and implausible considering the complex nature of the phenomena, and therefore, creating a model is just as problematic. Such an approach would end up ignoring the kind of descriptive and other details, which would be resourceful to the discursive analysis of communicative activities of reconciliation.

Reconciliation as healing and rehabilitation processes?

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) is known to be the most prominent and celebrated example of reconciliation practices in today's world. Swartz and Drennan observe that the TRC has been widely hailed by mental health practitioners and others as source of psychological healing (Swartz and Drennan, 2000). Despite the small number of direct participation, "the TRC was constituted partly as an instrument of national healing" (p. 205). The claims about the TRC's foreseen effect to the national politics and its benefits to people's mental health cast some questions about the impact of clinical psychology as social practice on the cultural construction of traumatic memory and healing. Thus, they set out to examine the role of mental health practitioners and mental health institutions in the post-TRC period. They argue that it is important to distinguish between individual and collective healing (Swartz and Drenman, 2000). This observation seems to justify a need for setting up similar institutions and organising programs for reconciliation, but one might wonder how these claims for healing and rehabilitation are made and believed to be true. Ironic as

it may be, the researchers themselves are puzzled by "the sense of chaos and confusion" about their own findings to the question of the role of TRC as a tool for national healing.

> If the TRC is seen to be as much about personal reconciliation and truth as about a political process, we may well ask how such resources (e.g., proper hearings with language interpretation services, etc.) can be made available to the TRC and not to the state services, which both predated the TRC and will continue to be there into the future. (Swartz and Drenman, 2000, p. 211)

It seems that the healing and rehabilitation are not simply the matter of availability and provision of psychological treatment and other resources, but the status of TRC and its implications to the future national and international politics. Here I am not disputing therapeutic claims about reconciliation programs with varying degrees of orientation to psychological and psychiatric practices. I argue that the notion of healing and rehabilitation may be worthy of re-specification as to what it is that people claim to have healed from and how the normative condition to which they claimed to have rehabilitated happen. The discursive approach looks at the construction of participants' use of categories such as healing and rehabilitation, as well as teasing out key issues as to what it means for them to do reconciliation.

Apart from the case of the TRC, a few examples of the research on the elderly, which seem to add insight into discussion of reconciliation and direct us to some issues that are yet to be explored. Peter Coleman re-evaluated the significance and value of reminiscence based on Robert Butler's concept of life review (Butler, 1963) in the psychiatric research of the war veterans' reminiscences. Stressing the importance of examining identity and self-esteem in reminiscence work, he proposes the creation of a life story as one of the tasks of reconciliation (Coleman, 1999). A crucial omission to Coleman's discussion, however, is a consideration and integration of discursive analytic approach to reminiscence (Middleton and Buchanan, 1991; Buchanan and Middleton, 1993; Middleton and Buchanan, 1993; Buchanan and Middleton, 1994; Buchanan and Middleton, 1995). The discursive work by Buchanan and Middleton adds further evidence to the current re-examination of reconciliation as identity work in the framework of social organisation of the past.

Social practices of story-telling

Taking a view of reconciliation as "harmony between the past, present, and future," Coleman (1999, p. 134) proposes the four characteristics of a successful life story:

coherence of themes (or linking thread), assimilation (i.e., appropriateness of inclusion and exclusion of events), structure (i.e., beginnings and endings), and truth value (i.e., truth from the author's account, or authenticity). How fulfilling would these characteristics be to make a successful story telling, and how would such success be evaluated by whom? In other words, is a story good as long as if it incorporates these characteristics? A good story to whom? His concern with "a good story" privileges a presupposed standard, or assumes some kind of formula for good reminiscence practice. Furthermore, he seems to be formulating his definition of what it is to do reconciliation as he insists "central to the task of creating a life story is achieving reconciliation between conflicting elements" (Coleman, 1999, p. 138). But these ideas about reconciliation and creating a life story are based on his reflection on his psychiatric practices. If, as he argues, "the life story itself confers benefits on the listeners, and confirms the author in his or her generativity" (p. 138), then the social and dialogic relationship as to how the story is told and how the significance of the story is understood by the others needs to be examined as well, not just what goes in the story.

The consensus so far seems to be that story telling is one of the essential features of reconciliation. Concurring with Coleman's view of reconciliation, Norval says that story-telling practice seems to be a principal human activity that engages people in reconciliation activities (Norval, 1998). Norval argues that "one of the most important effects of the memory work of the TRC is the way in which it has offered an occasion for survivors to gain recognition of their plight in full public view" (Norval, p. 258). These public hearings bring out everyday injustices perpetrated against ordinary citizens into the public domain and make the significance of hearings and search for justice visible. She seems to argue that the TRC has allowed moral sanctioning of the past wrongdoing and gives voice to average people to rise from the silence. In this sense, their participation in a public memorial exercise has different consequences from the standard nationalist use of memory and monuments. If telling the truth, social practice of story telling is the heart of the reconciliation activities, what does it lead to? Does it simply create a profusion of memories and versions of the past including unpleasant details of violence and other events. The memory work, therefore, performs a multitude of complicated functions.

What then is the role of story telling in reconciliation and memory work in dealing with the troubling past caused by war conflicts? I now turn to narrative as "a

means of cultural peace keeping" (Bruner, 1990a, p. 95). Bruner states that the narrative is "the human gift for presenting, dramatising, and explicating the mitigating circumstances surrounding conflict-threatening breaches in the ordinariness of life" (p. 95). He goes on to say:

> The objective of such narrative is not to reconcile, not to legitimize, not even to excuse, but rather to explicate. And the explications offered in the ordinary telling of such narratives are not always forgiving of the protagonist depicted. Rather, it is the narrator who usually comes off best... Our sense of the normative is nourished in narrative, but so is our sense of breach and exception. Stories make "reality" a mitigated reality... Without those narrative skills, we could never endure the conflicts and contradictions that social life generates. We would become unfit for the life of culture. (Bruner, pp. 95-7)

Narrative is a way of framing (organising and re-organising) the past.

> Framing provides a means of "constructing" a world, of characterising its flow, of segmenting events within that world, and so on. If we were not able to do such framing, we would be lost in a murk of chaotic experience and probably would not have survived as a species in any case. (Bruner, p. 57).

Discourse of public commemoration/Remembrance of the logic of closure

Following from this, let us see how this feature of narrative works for the complex nature of memory work that Norval (1998) refers to. In using Norval's analogy, remembrance (or retention) signifies the incompleteness of the present and "remembrance of the logic of closure" (p. 259). These two notions, however, are paradoxical. He argues that "[I]n remembering apartheid (as a logic of closure), the work of the TRC may open a space for difference which will not immediately be subsumed and transformed into a logic of othering" (Norval, 1998, p. 259). The counter-monument movement in Germany is a case in point and parallels to the South African case. Also, in her study of Vietnam memorial and cultural and personal constructions of war memories in narratives, Sturken (1991) states that discourse of public commemoration is closely linked to the question of how war is brought to a closure in American society. This impetus for closure, putting an end to some troubling problematic past hovering over those victims and survivors of violence seems to be tied to reconciliation. War memorials and other forms of war narratives serve "a central icon of the 'healing' process of confronting difficult past experiences" (Sturken, p. 119, emphasis original). It can be argued then that it is not a particular commemorative exercise, therapy and reconciliation program that lead to healing for

those who were traumatised and hurt, but it is the act of remembering and not-remembering (forgetting) that puts some past to closure in the incompleteness as a result of transformation and change of perception and attitude toward the former perpetrators. Norval does not seem to subscribe to a contemporary democratic ideal that publicising memories of different groups would benefit each person from knowing and respecting the other's version of the past and thereby understand better what divides and unifies them. Instead, she suggests that the continuous re-working and re-elaboration of the past point towards a fundamental impossibility: the impossibility of completion. Her assessment of TRC and its potential for reconciliation are sceptical. "The TRC potentially celebrates and commemorates not completion and national myths of origin in their full splendour, but the impossibility of identity, of the purity of origins, and also of reconciliation" (p. 261). If her view of reconciliation on the TRC's case is true and a full reconciliation with the other and with the self is indeed impossible, what is left for us? This is a disconcerting view of reconciliation. Are there any settlements? How do we settle with this impossibility? Do we have a closure or a way of ordering or putting an end to, and move forward from the gruesome memory of the past in the flow of present-ness as constantly changing social reality. If so, how does that happen?

The discussion so far has highlighted a major distinction between the dominant view of reconciliation and the discursive analytic approach. The assumption of the dominant view is rooted in the cognitive psychological model of reconciliation. It proposes to achieve harmony of an individual being liberating from inner conflict and cognitive dissonance, and bring about a resolution of two conflicting states and positions. The popularity of this model is often attributed to its power of integrated method as it takes into account both psychological and social factors, and therefore, it yields more validity and reliability. This nicely fits in the cognitive view and promises an economy of modelling because it aspires to be a universal model for building the theory and concept of reconciliation. But does it actually contribute to our understanding of nature of conflict and reconciliation between individuals, groups and nations? Instead of clinging to the cognitive view and model, the thesis will look at discursive practices with regard to the ways of people drawing a closure to the problematic past. The thesis sets out to produce empirically grounded observations of the people's discursive practices of reconciliation and argues that reconciliation is a discursively accomplished social activity.

Chapter summary

This chapter has provided a review of literature relevant to remembering and reconciliation. Starting with addressing the problem of psychological dualism of the individual vs. the social, I have introduced discursive psychological and social constructionist research on memory and remembering. The research suggest that remembering is a social, discursive activity in which people perform social actions of blaming, justifying, apologising and forgiving over a troubling past such as British POWs' experience of captivity by Japanese. In this view, people's use of language as cultural tools such as narratives, history and other rhetorical resources is central to studies of social remembering. Following from this, we have identified that the concept of reconciliation resembles our concern with psychological dualism. The discursive analytic approach to reconciliation sets a focus on people's accounting practices in which social construction of identity and accountability are made visible. The specific empirical issues identified include cultural otherness, the concept of time as non-linear, accounting for change, and social production of moral accountability and sense-making of significance of the past in interdependencies of individual and collective remembering. The chapter argues that talk (and writing) about reconciliation, as a form of remembering, can be examined in terms of how the speakers (and writers) display their positions regarding a particular version of the past and how those positions are claimed relative to a particular social relation and interactional setting. This perspective on reconciliation is contrasted with the cognitive-experimental perspective, which poses an essentialist question of whether or not the reconciliation experience is genuine. The discursive approach would not speculate on an inner, mental state of reconciliation, rather what is produced discursively as to what reconciliation means to then and how it happened is a situated interactional work of remembering. I have argued that that the concept of reconciliation merits a re-examination and analysis from a discursive approach. With this in mind, in the next chapter I provide an overview of the methodological orientation to social remembering and discursive reconciliation.

CHAPTER 2

Interviewing as social practice of reconciliation

Introduction

This chapter outlines methodological orientations to the thesis, discourse analysis and discusses theoretical implications of interviewing as social practice of reconciliation. The aims of the chapter are two-fold. First, I will provide a brief overview of the development of discourse analysis and discursive psychology by identifying philosophical foundations and theoretical assumptions of social sciences disciplines on which they are based. The discussion centres on discourse analysis and discursive psychology. Language is viewed as performing social action, and therefore with use of language, we socially construct our understanding of how the world is and negotiate meanings and establish shared understanding of the world. This results in variability of people's views and opinions regarding some aspects of the past at issue. This action orientation of language, and its construction of the life world would justify the thesis focus on reconciliation as social practice that is discursively accomplished. Second, the description of the data source, data collection and analytic procedures are provided in line with the view that interviews are social practices of reconciliation guided by a notion of active interviewing (Holstein and Gubrium, 1997).

As part of the overall argument that reconciliation is a discursively accomplished social activity, I will argue the interviews I conducted with the British ex-POWs constitute the very reconciliation activity in which discursive reconciliation is performed. The chapter discussion will highlight some of the key distinctions between the discourse analytical approach and the traditional approach to qualitative study in use of the interview as a research method. The comparison between the two aims brings about an exposition of features of a method employed in studying discursive accomplishment of reconciliation. In particular, I will address some principal features of interview as social practice of reconciliation, namely action orientation to talk, joint construction of meaning, stressing that social actions of blaming, justifying, forgiving, and apologising are performed, and reconciliation

becomes a practical interactional business that interview participants attend to and accomplish. Similarly, issues related to research ethics were considered as a members' practical concern that was accomplished interactionally.

Discourse analysis

Discourse analysis was born out of a synthesis of contemporary critical movements in psychology, in particular social psychology, cognitive and experimental psychology as well as other social sciences disciplines. The term, 'discourse', also has been used in a number of different ways within the discourse analysts and scholars of social sciences (Heath, 1997; Potter, 1998; Potter and Wetherell, 1987)[1]. The following background on discursive analysis is discussed in the work of Potter and Wetherell (1987) and Edwards and Potter (1992). The term discourse in a least limited sense, is used "to cover all forms of spoken interaction, formal and informal, and written texts of all kinds" (Potter & Wetherell, p. 7). The following discussion aims to outline some foundational issues and perspectives of language, which contributed to the development of discourse analysis and discursive psychology. This provides its theoretical and analytical grounds for the approach taken in the study of remembering and reconciliation.

Issues in discourse analysis

I now address principal features of discourse analysis, that are relevant to the project of the thesis (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). First, discourse analysis deals with naturally occurring talk and text, including interview transcripts. Second, discourse analysis is concerned with the content of talk, its subject matter and with its social rather than linguistic organisation (e.g., syntax, phonetics, semantics, etc.). Third, discourse analysis has a three-fold concern with action, construction and variability. In talking and saying things, people perform social action. Fourth, one of the central features of discourse analysis is with the rhetorical organisation (argumentative) organisation of everyday talk and thought. It looks into the dilemmatic nature of discourse attending to potential version of argument (Billig, 1987). Lastly, discourse analysis is concerned with the cognitive issue of reality and mind, in particular with how cognitive issues of

---

[11] "Unlike other forms of social science inquiry, ethnomethodology and conversation analysis do not provide a 'method', in the sense of clear-cut set of procedures that if followed will generate scientifically valid results or findings" (Heath, 1997, p. 184).

knowledge, belief, fact, truth and explanation are handled. This reflects its origins in the sociology of scientific knowledge (e.g., Mulkay, 1979) and the reworking of psychological categories of memory, attitude, learning, and so on.

In the following I will highlight features of discourse analysis, that are relevant to the project of the thesis. I will focus on the role of language, in particular with language as social action in considering contributions from the contemporary development of linguistic philosophy and studies of language.

Language as social action

The development of discourse analysis centres on the importance of language as a main focus of psychological investigation. It derives from philosophy, linguistics and literary studies as to how we view and understand the function of language. The discursive approach focuses on an action orientation feature of language, especially on the language use in context and social relations. Language is therefore not treated as merely a tool or medium to represent the inner states of the mind. Language takes up a larger and more central role in our everyday activities as they are performed through language.

Let us now look at the contemporary development of linguistics and philosophy of language, starting with Chomsky's work on the nature of language development and acquisition. His theory features what is termed as generative grammar, a set of underlying linguistic rules that innately exists in the form of deep structure (Chomsky, 1965). Chomsky assumes that human beings are born with so-called Language Acquisition Device (Chomsky, 1966), which allows them to produce grammatically correct sentences without formal instruction. The problem of this approach is that it tries to separate the issue of linguistic competence from linguistic performance, when linguistic performance and competence are not easily separable and intricately related to one another. In critiquing his approach, Potter and Wetherell (1987) note that Chomsky's empirical work is taken with the speech data that is idealised compared with ordinary speech. Such data is so far removed from the natural speech, with errors, hesitations, self-corrections, etc., that it does not capture the interactional features of natural speech (Potter and Wetherell, 1987). In contrast, discourse analysis attends to the performance of naturally occurring speech in order to see how people are actually using language in the course of different kinds of interactions.

The second feature of discourse analysis pertains to the way in which the relation between the object (reality) and language is accomplished (Potter and Wetherell, 1987; Silverman, 1997, p. 115). Specifically it refers to the notion of sign (signifier and signified) as to how such an arbitrary relationship between the object and the linguistic labelling is established. This notion of sign derives from a Saussurean approach to signification and semiology, which heavily depends on the larger social structure of society. Whereas discourse analysis is interested in local production of meaning and knowledge, Saussurean linguistic approach links its analysis to an abstract level of social structures and other broader concerns of the society such as power, hierarchy, gender, and so forth. Theory of society is generated independently from what meanings are locally produced within a given linguistic and cultural community. In other words, semiology does not necessarily account for the local meaning making process—how members in a particular cultural community establish the social relations and moral order of the group using the language (Edwards, 1997; Potter and Wetherell, 1987).

Discourse analysis aims to explicate the process of producing and changing meanings at the time of their occurrence. According to Potter and Wetherell (1987), although shedding some light into the way language influences the way we understand the world, "[S]emiology tends to produce…static idealized analysis" (p. 31). The emphasis is placed on looking at structure ('la langue') rather than specific uses ('parole'), along with a focus on examining meaning at a single time rather than processes occurring over time, has ruled out a number of important and interesting questions." (Potter & Wetherell, p. 31).

Studies of the function of language are also concerned with examining the processes of labelling and pointing as language function, how the meaning—a set of relations between the object and the language—is produced over time. Speech act theory (Austin, 1975(1962)) moves away from the idea that primary function of language is to describe some state of affairs, some aspect of reality. Most useful distinction regarding the language use is between doing and stating, specifically the ways in which people use language to perform social actions. Let me use some modified examples that are cited in the work of Potter and Wetherell (1987):

For instance, the sentence:

I declare war on terrorism.

is not a description of the world which can seen as true or false. Rather it accomplishes some practical action and bring about some consequences when uttered in an appropriate circumstances. This example illustrates an action-orientation to language, that is, language is performing an action—request, declare, agree, disagree, etc. One of the main difficulties with speech act theory, however, is that it tends to deal with idealised linguistic phenomena or 'made' up sentences taken outside the context of use or highly ritualised speech forms. This problem is common to Chomskian approach. Often we hear a single utterance that performs a number of acts at once or acts may be spread out in more than one sentence including a question and response sequences. As Potter and Wetherell argue, "[i]n practice the decision about what act an utterance is performing is often made by referring to the response rather than to any features of the utterance itself." For instance, an utterance (opcit, p. 30):

A: it is nine o'clock yet?

B: yes, just gone.

In this exchange, A's utterance as to which speech act is used is understood only through B's response that A elicits. It is not within the A's utterance, but the B's uptake of A, how B interprets A's question. Speech act theory does not consider such sequential feature of interaction as a way of validating their categorisation of speech acts.

The thesis draws upon contributions made by Vygotsky and Wittgenstein as they both emphasised an importance of the role of language in development of knowledge, thought, memory and cognition. Vygotsky's theory of mediation and cultural tools and its relation to our activity influenced the development of discursive movement. The role of language in shaping thoughts and other cognitive functions, the action-orientation of language also developed extensively by Wittgenstein, in the notion of "language-games" (Wittgenstein, 1968 (1958)). He states that "the term "language-games" is meant to bring into prominence the fact that the speaking of language is part of an activity, or of a form of life" (para. 23). Regarding the problem of categorisation in social sciences, he comments:

> When philosophers use a word – 'knowledge', 'being', 'object' (etc.) … –– and try to grasp the essence of the thing, one must first ask oneself: it is the word ever actually used in this way in the language-game which is its original home? – What we do is to bring words back from their metaphysical to their everyday use. (Wittgenstein, 1968, para. 116).

His critique, similarly applied to semiology, refers to a problem of our understanding of relationship between language and context. It reveals the taken-for-granted nature of social scientists' producing arbitrarily constructed operational definitions of phenomena without ever studying the 'language-game' in which the phenomenon has its everyday home (Wittgenstein, 1968). Discourse analysis, in line with Wittgenstein's critique, is concerned about the problem of analysts' producing and superimposing their categories on the social phenomena and aims to explicate how members produce them and make them relevant in talk.

The aforementioned points suggest that analysis should be focused on the language use, not on excavating formal rules embedded in language and underlying cognitive processes. This means that the study of language does not confine itself to formal linguistic analysis as in the transformational grammatical approach and analysis of sentences that the analyst himself/herself generated to prove their point. Nor does it mean a diachronic approach of studying the history of the word meanings and explicating the process of change.

Discursive psychology

Discursive psychology is the culmination of a number of independent developments in psychology, sociology, linguistics, anthropology, and philosophy. It was born out of the critiques of traditional psychological methods—behaviourism and positivism (Gergen, 1978; Harré, 1979) and also the critique of psychological theory, cognitivism, which favours explanation in terms of mental states or processes. Roots of discursive psychology go as far as a number of independent developments, as far back as the work of G. H. Mead and L. S. Vygotsky (Harré and Gillet, 1994). In particular it incorporates contemporary movements such as Ethnomethodology (Garfinkel, 1967; Garfinkel, 1974; Heritage, 1984), social constructionism (e.g. Gergen, 1997; Shotter, 1990; Shotter, 1991), and ethogenics[2]. Edwards and Potter (1992) profile key features of discursive psychology in terms of action orientation, construction of knowledge about reality, and variability of versions of reality. The focus of discursive psychology is the action orientation of talk and writing. "For both participants and analysts, the primary issue is the social actions, or interactional work being done in the discourse" (ibid., p. 2). Moreover, its interest is the nature of

knowledge, cognition and reality as to how events are described and explained in the forms of factual reports, or narratives, and how cognitive states are attributed. Instead of assuming speaker's (or writer's) underlying cognitive states in such discursive constructions, they are examined in the context of their occurrence as situated and occasioned constructions."

I will now elaborate on the features of action orientation, construction and variability in order to identify a body of influence, namely ethnomethodology and conversation analysis, which made discourse analysis a viable approach for the concerns of this research on remembering and reconciliation.

Action orientation, construction, variability in mundane settings

The view of language as social action is also commonly shared in the sociological tradition of ethnomethodology (Garfinkel, 1967). It refers to "the investigation of the rational properties of indexical expressions and other practical actions as contingent ongoing accomplishments of organized artful practices of everyday life" (p. 11). As the term suggests, ethnomethodology is concerned with the study of (ology) ordinary people's (ethno) methods. It is the study of the methods that ordinary people use to produce and make sense of everyday life. Ethnomethodological research seeks to learn about commonplace activities of everyday life as phenomena in their own right. According to Sacks and Garfinkel (1967; Heritage, 1984), founders of ethnomethodology, talk is considered as an activity and 'doing' talking provides ways of understanding as to how common-sense views about the world and practical reasoning in a given situation get produced and shared.

The treatment of language as action is a common concern for discursive psychologists and ethnomethdologists. This implies that language is a constructive medium that people use resourcefully to accomplish things. The discourse analysis aims at explicating "the constructive and flexible ways in which language is used should themselves become a central topic of study" (Potter and Wetherell, 1987, p. 35). The present study of identity and accountability fully exploits this feature of language. It also follows that our position on the role of language allows us to see variability of people's views and opinions in talk (and texts). Ethnomethodology's concerns with the way members' knowledge and understanding get produced reflect

---

[2] "The term *ethogenics* was coined on the analogy of 'ethology,' the new science of animal behaviour that had been developed by the study of animal life in its real environments. It is defined as "the study

discursive psychology's interests in people's pragmatic use of language in terms of talk as action as practical accomplishment. Thus, the focus on variability yields analytical resources for studying accountability

Conversation Analysis is a discipline born out of ethnomethodology as a rigorous method and analytical approach to studying mundane conversations. Its basic assumptions are that interaction is structurally organised and contributions to interaction are contextually oriented. Hence, seemingly disorderly conversations are treated as structures in their own right and social in character. Its primary analysis is focused on sequential organisation of conversation—the ways in which people take turns in conversation, the management of repair, and the analysis of the topic organisation. The meaning and interpretation of the first speaker's utterance is examined in the second speaker's utterance. Heritage (1984) terms it as "intersubjectivity" and explains as follows:

> [S]ome analysis, understanding or appreciation of the prior turn will be displayed in the recipient's next turn at talk... Conversational interaction is structured by an organisation of action which is implemented on a turn-by-turn basis. By means of the organisation, a context of publicly displayed and continuously up-dated intersubjective understanding is systematically sustained... It is through the 'turn-by-turn' character of talk that the participants display their understanding of 'the state of the talk' for one another. (Heritage, 1984, p. 259)

The contribution of Conversation Analysis (CA) to discursive psychology is that CA provides evidential basis, or a proof procedure of how speakers establish intersubjectivity, shared understanding of reality in interaction. The analysis of the interview talk is empowered by the conversation analytic principles, and relevant issues to illustrate the performative nature of identity and constitutive process of accountability as action were examined.

The aforementioned features of discourse analysis and discursive psychology—action orientation, construction, and variability—have important implications for the present study of identity and accountability in the social practice of reconciliation. The discursive approach (i.e., the umbrella term for the methodological approach used in discourse analysis) attends to the particular analytic concerns of the thesis, that our identities arise out of interactions with other people. Identity is constituted in the interaction, and it resources to perform social actions such as invitations, agreements and disagreements, blamings, displays of neutrality,

---

of the genesis of meaningful conduct or accountable behavior" (Harré and Gillet, 1994).

etc. People's identities are achieved discursively by mobilising members' knowledge and understanding of social categories (e.g., age, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, etc.)—how the world works and what it is to be a member of a given community. The discursive approach does not take these categories as provided by the analysts without looking at what is actually produced in talk. People orient to these categories in talk and construct what they mean to them, rather than how those categories are shaping the way they think about their identities. The constitutive process of identities is important to the studies of social remembering and reconciliation. People do not produce consistently the same version of the past when accounting for a problematic past, especially the events relating to violence and other unpleasant acts committed during the war. People fashion talk (and texts) about the war-time past, orientating to identities of the speakers and the hearers and perform social actions in making his or her claim of the past. Hence, a multitude of discourses is constantly at work constructing and producing our identity. Variability of views, opinions and identity descriptions, therefore, work to be the analytical resource for discourse analysts.

I now move on to specific issues of methodology. Using the notion of active interviewing, I discuss how the discursive approach to remembering and reconciliation provides a rationale for interview as a main method to study social practices of reconciliation.

Active interviewing

Holstein and Gubrium (1997) use a term "active interviewing" to refer to a process where knowledge, meanings and understanding of the worlds are constructed. They note:

> Treating interviewing as a social encounter in which knowledge is constructed suggests the possibility that the interview is not merely a neutral conduit source of distortion, but is instead a site of, and occasion for, producing reportable knowledge itself. (Holstein and Gubrium, p. 114)

What they mean by "active" is that the both participants and the interviewer collaboratively participate in the process of knowledge production. They expand that:

> [I]nterviews are deeply and unavoidably implicated in creating meanings that ostensibly reside within respondents. Both parties to the interview are necessarily and ineluctably *active*. Meaning is not merely elicited by apt questioning, nor simply transported through respondent replies; it is actively and communicatively assembled in the interview encounter. (ibid.)

Active interview therefore has a bearing on the way we understand the role of interviewer-researcher as well as the research subject-researched. Let us see further how the dynamics of the researcher and the researched are considered from this perspective.

Subject-participant: Researcher vs. researched

So-called research subjects are often called participants, interlocutors, or speakers and hearers, who take part in social actions within the parameters of the research. , Holstein and Gubrium (1997) coin the term active subject for the interview which "transforms the subject behind the respondent from a repository of opinions and reasons or a wellspring of emotions into a productive source of knowledge" (p. 121). On the contrary, the traditional interview subjects are basically conceived as "passive *vessels of answers* for experimental questions put to respondents by interviewers" (p. 116). Also, the image of the subject is epistemologically passive, not engaged in the production of knowledge (p. 117). We can see consistently a passive, repository image of the subject in the traditional view, whereas the active interview, both the participants and the interviewer take part in the interactional process to co-construct knowledge and relying on a shared memory. This does not mean that both interviewer and participants interact one another with the same knowledge base. In fact, this gap of knowledge that both parties bring to the interactive setting is asymmetrical in the interviews (Drew, 1991; Linell and Luckmann, 1991; Silverman, 1993). The research is interested in the ways in which two parties, while in varying degrees of epistemic stance, work together to constitute a shared understanding of the past.

Construction of meaning v. truth telling

Active interviewing aims at the construction of meaning, whereas in the traditional view interview is regarded as truth-telling, that is, researchers set out to obtain accurate description of experience as report or representations of reality. For them, the obtained information is "the unadulterated facts and details of experience" (Holstein & Gubrium, p. 117) and "the experimental truths held by the passive subject" (p. 117). In active interviewing, the interviewer is engaged in multitude of tasks—administering questions, sustaining neutrality, and trying not to interfere with what the subject has to say. The interviewer actively participates in the constitutive process of knowledge production and negotiation of meanings. Thus, facticity and

truth telling are treated as a member's concern, a topic in its own right, rather than taking a role of a judge to decide whether what was offered as accounts is true or false.

The relationship between the researcher and the interview respondents (or the researched) in active interview radically differs from the traditional approach to interview when it comes to its goals and aims. The subject in a traditional sense is more static and plays a passive role, whereas in the active interviewing the participants are regarded as active agents co-constructing knowledge and collaboratively establishing understanding with the researcher-interviewer. Therefore, the focus of the analysis is cast on the interaction, ways in which how shared understanding, or intersubjectivity, in particular circumstance is achieved and how collaboration is established between participants in the interview. The researcher-interviewer takes part in the constitutive process of knowledge sharing her understanding of the past, how things were then. Thus, the retrospective view of the past is not an outcome of individual cognitive functioning, but a joint-construction of the past from the point of view of the present.

How do we make sense of what is being uttered in the interview? Are those accounts of the past regarded as straightforward true representation of the reality? This question relates to the realism-relativism debate (Edwards, Ashmore et al., 1995) over the status of truth(s) and facticity of the accounts given in the interview. In active interviewing, "[I]nterviewing is a concerted project for producing meaning" (p. 121). What's more, it is a continuous process of producing meaning and re-configuring it. Meanings are constantly developing, which makes the interview occasion a dynamic, meaning-making, and interpretive practice. As Holstein and Gubrium put it, "the procedures and resources are used to apprehend, organise and represent reality" (p. 121). Instead of treating the interview as "undistorted communication between the interviewer and respondent" (p. 116), the interview reveals an evolving process of new meanings and constantly changing nature of our world with the use of language.

Both interview parties are sensitive to thoughts and feelings of their own and others through continuous monitoring of one another. "The interview respondents, not only offer substantive thoughts and feelings pertinent to the topic under consideration, but simultaneously and continuously monitor who they are in the relation to the person questioning them" (p. 122). In so doing both interview participants and interviewer display concerns for one another. Hence, there is no static, fixed meaning

as an outcome of interaction. It is a reflexive interpretive process in which "information offered is continually developed in relation to ongoing interview interaction." (p. 122). The interview "reveals reality-constructing practices as well as the subjective meanings that are circumstantially conveyed" (p. 127).

Interviewing as social action of reconciliation

Interviewing as a research method has gained a growing popularity alongside interest in qualitative research to study psychological and sociological phenomena. The present study exploits this growing popularity and used interviews as a discursive setting where personal experiences of the war are told and the significance of such experiences are reconfigured and shared with others in the interaction. Holstein (1997) observes that contemporary society in the recent years has become the interview society where "the interview is becoming more and more commonplace, also making it a 'naturally occurring' occasion of articulating experience" (p. 126). This observation emphasises that the interview is more than just a means for obtaining data. Interviewing is a naturally occurring interactional phenomenon and provides arenas of conversational action. It is not simply a method for data gathering; it is where the social actions of blaming, apologising, forgiving, justifying, arguing, etc. are made visible and become subject to empirical observation via examination of identity and accountability. Thus, the thesis takes a theoretical position in which interview is chosen as a methodologically and theoretically viable option of studying the social practice of reconciliation. In other words, interview is a form of communication in which discursive actions regarding issues of reconciliation are accomplished (Silverman, 1993). Silverman (1993) notes that "[F]rom the point of view of interview-as-local-accomplishment, interview data are not 'one side of the picture' to be balanced by observation of what respondents actually do or to be compared with what their role partners say" (p. 104).

From this standpoint, I consider interviewing as an interactional occasion where reconciliation is discursively accomplished. Interviewing itself is a social practice of reconciliation, and therefore deserves an analytical investigation. It is also a social phenomenon, in which people gather and share their views and experiences of the past, while attending to what is at stake and what in the past matters to the interview participants in the present circumstances. It follows that in the activity of interviewing (or being interviewed) accountability of past and present actions is

performed. The analysis of the interactional data illustrates that interviewing offers a participatory framework in which the researcher is actively recruited into social practices of reconciliation. It is not just a mere description of the field, or the source of information for ethnographer to obtain a bird's eye view of a particular cultural practice of former POWs' reconciliation. It is the place of a social activity in which discursive reconciliation is accomplished. To explicate the social nature of discursive reconciliation, the analytical chapters examine three accounting practices--accounting for others, accounting for the past, and accounting for change.

We have established that interviewing is not merely a technique to collect people's view and opinions from one particular point of view. It is regarded as a social activity in which both interviewer and interviewees rely on their common sense knowledge of social structures in order to produce locally 'adequate' utterances (Silverman, 1993). To make this point clear, let me draw from my anecdotal experience. When describing my research to others, I explained that it had something to do with war memories. This explanation quickly generates a normative expectation as to what people think of war memories and how they affect people. A number of people asked me if I had experienced animosity and verbal aggression from the ex-POWs and how they treated me in general. This question seems to suggest the assumption being that the project was oral history, as if some graphic tales of atrocities and violence at war were to be recorded in the research. Furthermore, it was also assumed that the telling of atrocity stories by former British POW's they would also display hostility to me because of my ethnic and cultural background and appearance. Such reactions to my research display their common sense understanding and culturally grounded normative assumption of what it is to study a particular group of people with a particular research focus. In fact, this anecdote precisely illuminates a cross-cultural dimension of the research where a Japanese interviewer had a face-to-face talk with the British interview participants. Cultural differences between the two parties become interactional resources in the discussion of issues regarding reconciliation. The interview therefore yields a highly contentious occasion in which the issue of reconciliation is topicalised and problematised. What is more, interviewing provides a setting for joint remembering (and forgetting) of a problematic past, in which the interviewees and the interviewer orient to the issue of reconciliation and doing remembering together with regards to a problematic war-time past and related post-war difficulties that the ex-POWs experienced. In other

words, the interview is not 'about' reconciliation. Rather interviewing is the process of reconciliation.

The thesis documents this act of joint remembering in the setting of research interview. The interviewing is a data-making opportunity, not a data-collecting activity in a traditional sense of qualitative research. The interview talk, therefore has an active orientation to knowledge and shapes shared understanding of the participants' view of the past, present and future.

To recap, interview talk is regarded as a conversational action; it is an interactional event where views and opinions are expressed and meanings are negotiated and created in situ. Therefore, the interviewer participates in this interactional meaning-making event, unlike the traditional view that he/she maintains a neutral position. What is focused then is the accounting practices, the ways in which accounts are given and describe actions and events. In accounting for the past, interview is not treated as "truth telling" as if truth would come eventually. In terms of the nature of knowledge, knowledge is socially constituted rather than it being retrieved in the information processing to reveal to the public domain. Thirdly, interviewing is a data-making rather than data-collection. It is not simply taking the information as is, but participants and the interviewer perform social actions in account giving activity. Conceived as accounting practices, interviewing offers a place for identity work to be accomplished. Identities related to culture, ethnicity, race, gender, and age are made relevant to the on-going topical progression of the talk. The talk reveals the members understanding of what it is to be a competent member of a particular culture. Part of the analytical interest relates to the member's use of the category "culture." Culture is not a pre-given conceptual category, explicating how a cultural membership shapes a certain identity, but it should be understood in terms of how such categories are used to claim and establish the identity and how it is discursively constituted. This approach to identity is best illustrated in the analytical concept of membership categorisation (Sacks, 1992). Interview as accounting practices make visible members' work of accountability of the past – what happened, how and why it happened. In terms of knowledge, the participants and the interviewer tend to have a gap in terms of the actual experience and knowledge whether it is based on the direct and lived experience, or inherited, heard or told, indirect knowledge. Thus the analysis will illustrate ways of asymmetrical organisation of knowledge in interview talk (Drew, 1991; Linell and

Luckmann, 1991; Silverman, 1993). These features of active interviewing have a direct bearing on the way interviewing is conceived as a social practice, rather than an opportunity to extract, collect and retrieve information about the past in contention. In the following, I will discuss the analytic procedures from a point of view of discourse analytic approach.

Post-interview analytical procedures and handling of data

In this section, I describe analytical procedures and include methodological considerations and implications of active interviewing in the post-interview phase of research activities. Especially, the concerns over research methodology are addressed in terms of achieving validity, reliability and generalisability, and considering research ethics. I use the concept of reflexivity to raise the important issues I considered in phases of data processing and transcribing process. Reflexivity relates to the interpretive and analytic processes in considering how the researcher handles data and transforms the raw data, audio recording, of the interview talk to an analysable form in which recurring reflexive analytic process is made possible.

Nature of data and its handling: Raw data and transcript

A total of five interviews were conducted with the ex-POWs and their family members, two of them were group interviews with up to eight participants in one room. Potential difficulties taken into account are how to ensure a quality recording of group interview talk when more than one person tends to speak at the same time. Poor audio quality of the interview recording was anticipated as a potential problem, and some measures were taken to counter the problem. Especially, a problem of capturing overlapping talk was dealt with by placing two tape recorders in one room for group interview, in order to capture the speech overlap and softer utterances of speakers because some of them were not close to the microphone.

The recording of the interview talk was transcribed according to Gail Jefferson's transcription conventions for analysis (see Appendix 1 for full notation). They reflect the requirements of analysing talk as a social activity rather than as an expression of ideas, phonetics, or grammar. We tend to see that our conventional orthography (as in written text) is a neutral way of representing spoken language (talk). However, it is not the case for discourse analysis, although it leaves a lot of room for debate. The advantage of making formal, worked up transcripts is that "they

encourage and permit the analytic stance toward language that examines it as discourse, as performing actions, rather than neutrally expressing and communicating thoughts, or representing the world, or 'realizing' grammar" (Edwards, 1998, handout). The transcription symbols signify intonation, speech delivery and some other prosodic features that are made relevant for the discourse analysis employed in the thesis.

After each interview was conducted, the audio-recorded tapes of the interviews were transcribed verbatim, but the transcription was still in a rough format as it was to see on paper what had been said at the interview. This first stage of the transcribing did not attend to detailed aspects of talk without recording speech and other non-verbal features of the interview talk such as intonation, pitch, emphasis, pause in second, repetition, etc. The second phase of transcription was more involved with attentive listening to the talk for interactionally relevant features, following Jefferson's transcription conventions (Atkinson and Heritage, 1984). Rich, worked-up transcripts provide for highly detailed and publicly accessible representations of social interaction (Peräkylä, 1997). They are an analytic resource because the transcription notation makes talk features visible and allows the analyst to examine the interactional features concerning his/her analytic themes. This means that the analysis undergoes more than a single browsing of the data across the board. It involves repeated examination in pursuit of focused issues and purposes. Thus, the analysis is a reflexive process, starting from the transcription (Ashmore and Reed, 2000, December; Holstein and Gubrium, 1997).

The transcription task is not simply a task of transforming the raw speech data to the transcribed written material, but it is part of achieving reliability. "[Reliability] refers to the degree of consistency with which instances are assigned to the same category by different observers or by the same observer on different occasions" (Hammersley, 1992, p. 68; Silverman, 1993). In the discursive approach to data, transcribing is an analytical task, as it produces a particular gloss on text as part of interpretive process (Ashmore and Reed, 2000, December). Raw data is regarded as the equivalent to the field notes that ethnographers produce. The transcription is part of interpretive practice; it does not simply represent facts and truth.

Furthermore, the discursive approach values the variability of data, and such variability is treated as analytical resource rather than a stumbling block toward achieving reliability. Kirk and Miller (1986) refer to three different notions of

reliability: (1) Quixotic reliability, 'the circumstances in which a single method of observation continually yields an unvarying measurement", (2) diachronic reliability "the stability of an observation through time", (3) synchronic reliability "the similarity of observations within the same time-period" (p. 145). These concerns of achieving reliability in the traditional positivist approach to qualitative study are not germane to discourse analysis since it takes up variability as resource and is interested in the constantly changing nature of social reality. The thesis reveals a moment-by-moment accomplishment of identity and accountability in talk. Thus analytical and interpretive tasks of coding, grouping or summarizing the descriptions are meant to provide a version of reality in an ethnomethodological sense—"a coherent organizing framework that encapsulates and explains aspects of the social world that respondents portray" (Holstein and Gubrium, 1997, p. 127).

Research ethics as discursive accomplishment

In this section, I would like to focus on how ethical issues become relevant in the course of research in terms of the participants' orientation to research ethics. Since the research involves the production of accounts concerning unpleasant aspects of people's past experiences, discomfort and other damaging consequences for the individual's future life might occur. Therefore, it is important to consider the ethical implications and other consequences that would affect the participants in their research. Prior to the field work and data collection, I consulted the British Psychological Society's code of conduct for ethical principles for conducting research. Abiding by the BPS code of conduct, I made initial contact over the telephone after obtaining from the informant a list of ex-POWs who took part in the reconciliation trip to Japan. In the initial contact over telephone, I explained the purpose of the research. The majority of them agreed to take part in the research. A few potential interviewees had impairments that limited their mobility and communication and therefore were unable to take part in the interview despite their great interest. Subsequently, a formal letter was sent to those who agreed to participate. The letter informed the participants of the general overview of research, objectives of the interview including a few key interview questions, and a brief biography of the researcher. In the following, I will reflect on some instances and discuss research ethics as an emerging interactional process.

Protecting participants?

I point out some interesting contradictions and sensitive issues of research ethics. Research ethics are significant part of reconciliation work as the thesis argues ethics is an interactional phenomenon. A particular interest in ethics involves who is protecting whom from what interests and what expected outcome. With regard to protecting the interview participants, the information I provided in the soliciting letter includes the procedures and the objectives of the interview visit and the overall aim of the research before the interview began. Following the British Psychological Society's guidelines (section 8.1),[3] no covert tape-recording was exercised. The participants all willingly agreed that I kept the tape-recorder switched on during the entire time of the interview. I recorded the segment of the talk asking the participants for consent and ensuring confidentiality and anonymity. This replaces participants' signing on a piece of paper for agreement. These ethical issues such as obtaining consent, debriefing, confidentiality and protecting participants emerged within the parameters of the research practices, namely the very process of the interviewing. In the actual interviews, issues to do with research ethics were handled rather differently by the participants. For the participants, these ethical issues were not necessarily constraints or mandatory procedural steps to be cleared, as they were designed to protect the participants by the code of conduct in psychological research. What are stipulated under these issues work to protect the researcher in terms of his or her own accountability of doing social sciences research with participants. In a sense, the researcher's attention and efforts to abide by research ethics indicate the researcher's morality about the ways in which the research is conducted. This does not mean that the participants' concern over these ethical issues are not identical.

The present research goes beyond so-called standard approach to research ethics in psychological studies with using qualitative method. Discourse analysis attends to a different way in which ethical issues were made relevant and topicalised by the ex-POW participants. For instance, when the researcher presents these ethical principles for conducting research to the participants (abiding by British Psychological Society rules), they put forward their own agenda and revealed what was at stake and relevant to their interests according to their current position on the ethical concerns put forward by the researcher. For example, all the participants said

---

[3] 8.1 "[I]nvestigators have a primary responsibility to protect participants from physical and mental harm during the investigation.'

that they preferred not to be anonymised and to be identified with real names in the research publication. They had no problem with tape recording their talk, and even offered to give further, follow-up interviews. They supported the disclosure of their talk being outside of their immediate context. These participants' concerns were directly addressed in the interview.

Their orientation and uptake of ethical issues became an analytical concern. The point being is that research ethics are part of the topics that members express as their live concerns. As a researcher, what is stipulated in the BPS guidelines and code of conduct serve as the researcher's guidelines in conducting research. These guidelines are the code of conduct made for practitioners of research operating within the research community, and they do not necessarily correspond to the agenda and concerns of the participants. Research ethics is produced to sustain morality of the research practice in the research community, which emerges out of a particular political, social and cultural context (in this case the researchers'). As it is written, the code of conduct and ethical guidelines are designed for the participants, but in actuality, they can work against the participants interests. The ensuing chapters will present the detailed analysis and discussions on this issue of displaying their moral position of taking part in the university research in accordance with their view of reconciliation. Discourse analysis makes visible these ethical issues as a live concern of the researcher as well as the participants in the ways in which participants themselves put forward their ethical criteria concerning their involvement in the research.

The argument here is that research ethics is members' (i.e. both participants and analyst) practical business that is accomplished interactionally. It concerns the practices of accountability in which members (both the ex-POW participants and the researcher) negotiate the meaning, implications and consequences of being involved with research and establish their mutual expectation and understanding of what it is to become part of the current research. These emergent ethical issues guide the researcher in her research practice with respect to not only how she behaves toward the participants, but also what she writes and makes public about the research. The issue here is how her research findings are to be used in ways that matter to the participants as well as the researcher. While the thesis research examines the participants' accountability, the thesis itself is the researcher's work of accountability on the topic investigated. The discursive approach proposes that ethical issues in

social sciences research can be looked at as a local interactional accomplishment, in which the participants and the researcher discursively negotiate morality and social order of participating in social action. Accordingly, talk about consent, confidentiality, and anonymity are treated as a discursive resource by the participants and the researcher.

For example, this issue of the future consequences of the research project was addressed by the participants at various stages of the interviews, and the analysis of the exchange on this topic and discussion are included in Chapter 4. To illustrate this point, they frequently asked what I would do with the research and whether I would turn the thesis into a book for general readership. They appear to regard my research activity and book publication as a way of keeping record or even doing oral history. In this sense, the researcher becomes part of their activity of remembering the past. The researcher becomes a spokesperson in their projects of remembering and voicing a problematic past. Research is in this sense is not an independent organically framed activity, but mutually exploitative in pursuing each other's interests and agenda. From the discursive perspective, social science research is part of a reflexive process. It is not a context-independent project removed from the live concerns of all participants, but profoundly consequential to the lives of the participants. In analysing reconciliation as a discursive issue, the willingness and agreement of interviewees to take part in the research demonstrate the reconciliatory work that they perform in participating without having to making an explicit claim that they are reconciled.

Chapter summary

This chapter has discussed the rationale of using discourse analysis as a method to examine reconciliation as a discursive accomplishment. It has highlighted principal features of discourse analysis by tracing major influences from linguistic philosophy and identifying development of discursive psychology. Variability, construction, and action orientation of language are identified as key features relevant to studying remembering and reconciliation as social practice. Following from this discussion, I have introduced a notion of active interviewing and have argued that the present research provided an interactional opportunity for the participants to perform discursive reconciliation along with the interviewer. In contrast to the traditional sense of interviewing as data-collecting, truth-fact finding mode of investigation, the thesis has taken a position that interview is a constructive process where participants'

understanding and knowledge about the past are socially shared and negotiated. The constructive, performative and relative view of interview is the discernible distinction in discursive approach. Similarly, ethics is also handled interactionally as to what it means for the participants to take part in university research on reconciliation. The thesis analyses participants' talk activities about research ethics as interactional phenomena. The next chapter, launching the discourse analysis, illustrates the issues raised in this chapter. It will showcase the main feature of discourse analysis through examination of letters to the editor. We will see the working of language in use-- variability as resource, construction of meanings, and action orientation to language in the letter writing practice. The particular focus is on identity and its descriptions as to how the writer's use of identity and its descriptions resources the performance of social actions of blaming, justifying, forgiving and seeking reconciliation and apology.

CHAPTER 3

Identity-in-action: Accountabilities in reconciliation and apology

Introduction

This chapter examines how individuals and society-at-large remember war-time events and experiences regarding people's participation in events and activities in consequence of World War II. Events and activities focused in this chapter were occasioned in a recent state visit of Japanese emperor to Britain in May 1998. The chapter looks at rhetorical use of identity and its descriptions in accountability practices concerning this visit. I mean by accountability practices people's use of ordinary language such as apologies, restitution, explanations, justifications, defenses, explanations, arguments, narratives and the like (Buttny, 1993). In other words, I examine the ways in which people use their identity to position themselves in accounting for what happened in the war, how it happened and who is responsible. Various forms of accountability practices regarding the Japanese emperor's state visit were manifested in a nation-wide debate over what constitutes a proper apology, what are the forms of adequate compensation, and who should initiate such apology and compensation. The data used for analysis are seven letters that appeared on the letters to the editor's page in *The Independent*, a British broadsheet newspaper (Letters, 1998).

The aim of the chapter is twofold; first, to analyse the letters in terms of how a particular identity is nominated and how it is used to perform a social action with respect to war-related events and experiences. This initial analysis is used to define the umbrella themes of the thesis: discursive psychological approach to identity, accountability and social remembering regarding social practices of reconciliation and apology. The identified and defined issues in this chapter will be revisited and probed further using other sets of discourse data. The second aim is to present a rationale for the focus on the issue of reconciliation. The subsequent three chapters present

empirically grounded observations and discussions on accountability in social practices of reconciliation.

The event

In 1998 on May 27 the Japanese emperor and empress made a state visit to the United Kingdom. Scores of former prisoners of war in W.W.II organised and staged protests. The focus of their concern was the hosting of a head of state from a country who in their view had not provided a satisfactory level of apology and compensation concerning their treatment as prisoners of war. Their anti-Japanese sentiment was widely reported in the news media during this state visit. An ex-POW burned the Japanese flag as the state parade passed by. The photographed images of his flag burning and other acts of protest adorned the front cover of many of the following day's national newspapers. A group of ex-POWs and family members turned their backs and whistled "Colonel Bogey" (the theme tune from David Lean's celebrated film "The Bridge on the River Kwai") as the carriage of the Emperor and Empress passed by the crowd.

Throughout the state visit the British media covered official activities and receptions hosted by the British Royal family and the government. In addition, there was extensive coverage of welcoming events organised by local communities in England and Wales. The whereabouts and activities of the Japanese dignitaries dominated the headlines of prime-time news and daily newspapers across the nation. This media coverage re-ignited nation-wide debate concerning the hostile and distressed voices of representative of Far Eastern veterans organisations and family members of the deceased former POWs. Multifarious views and opinions were expressed featuring memories of the camp and stories of many years of suffering from physical and psychological problems such as post-traumatic stress disorder. Meanwhile, the media presenting contrasting views of British and Japanese diplomats, politicians and business leaders, appeasing the views of vociferous former prisoners of wars. These arguments concerned the promotion of cultural understanding and emphasised the benefit of nurturing amicable Anglo-Japanese relations in connection with the continuing level of Japanese investments and stimulation of employment opportunities in Britain.

Such debate is a prime example of how people in society, whether a small community or society at large, make sense of the past which provokes strong views

and sentiments involving major world events. Even though the war ended over half a century ago and since then Japan and its people have re-established high profile membership in the global economy and international community of politics and diplomacy, the war is a live issue in many people's lives. The state visit was an event that prompted and begs a re-examination of war responsibility—restitution and reparation, and apology concerning Japanese aggression and atrocities committed during W.W.II. My main concern is with what it is to remember and forget the past and how people's understanding and memories of the past shape the way people handle the issue of war responsibility. The debate provides a setting to study the way people remember and forget the war and its related events and how the past concerning the war continues to resonate in the present. In other words, the present status of the past becomes a topic of live concern (Middleton, 1997b; Middleton and Edwards, 1990). From this perspective, I approach the question of how people remember and forget the past by examining the disparate range of social actions in which people engaged themselves occasioned by this state visit. Such social actions being showcased in the letters page, I examine the discursive practices with respect to reconciliation and apology and the way people position themselves on these issues.

Data and background

The data consist of seven letters written to the editor in a letters page in *The Independent*, a British national newspaper. They were published on May 28, 1998 on the day following the protests and demonstrations staged by former British POWs and family members alike. Most of the protesting ex-POWs had worked in Thai-Burma railways or had experienced captivity in Japanese military prison camps during the World War II. The letters on this topic for that particular issue were no doubt selected from a range of such letters to the newspaper. The newspaper acknowledges on top of the page that "the letters may be edited for editorial purposes," presumably to fit into limited space of the page and for economy of expressions. I do not claim that the letters necessarily corresponds directly with the actual text delivered by its original authors to the newspaper. However, no matter what sub-editing may have been exercised, it is possible to analyse the action-orientation feature of identity descriptions presented in the published form of the letters as they are.

The letters are quoted in verbatim in full text using the exact format that appeared in the letters page of the newspaper. Paragraphing and indentation, as well

as font face are faithful to the original. The only addition is the letter number, which was given arbitrarily to each letter to facilitate classifying the letters and referencing them in my analysis and discussion. I present each letter in sequential order, from the left column to the right, top to bottom as it appeared in the paper. This order of presentation of the text data simply follows the convention of reading texts in English. I do not assume that there is an editorial intention in the ordering of the letters, nor would I attempt to claim a sociological view that the letters page as a whole represents a position of the media appropriating and manipulating people's views.

Accountability of the past in reconciliation and apology

The letters represent a range of views relating to the issues of reconciliation and apology. The letters make direct reference to these topics, asserting the necessity to forget and/or forgive, blame, and take responsibility (or not) for the events and circumstances surrounding what it was to be a prisoner of war in the Far East during W.W.II. The following general analytical question is asked: how do people design discourse, both talk and text, to establish the rationality of their position in a particular social setting (Edwards and Potter, 1992; Potter and Wetherell, 1987). Specific to the present analysis concerns how the text of the letter accomplishes social action of legitimating the reasonableness of expressed views, opinions and claims. A whole range of questions can be addressed for the analysis. How are accounts and descriptions organised in order to display the rationality of a letter writer's position? What resources are mobilised and made relevant to produce an account of the past? In particular, what identity categories are used to establish credibility as a letter writer? How are these identities managed in the discursive act of letter writing? What kind of cultural-historical meanings are invoked in the use of particular identity? How are other experiences and memories mobilised to assert a writer's particular argumentative position? By attending to these questions, the analysis illustrates the performative nature of the language (Potter and Wetherell, 1987). Letter writing constitutes a form of social action in which a discursive act of remembering is at work. In other words, memories of the past are mobilised and mark relevant identities in accountability of past actions and events at W.W.II. They are used communicatively in performing social actions of justifying, blaming, and apologising, etc. These actions are dealing with in the discursive act of letter writing in terms of the consequences of past actions and their implications for the present and future.

Identity-in-action and reconciliation

Forgive but not forget: Narrative of experience

Common sense tells us that people's claims about a past are not always consistent across time and places. They often vary because their understanding of the past is shaped by a particular position that they take. The letter by James Bradley (letter no. 59) makes a case that despite being a former "Far East prisoner of war" he does not share the same past and experiences with the other POW veterans. His experience as a "Far East prisoner of war" does not accord with the view that represents the other veterans associations and campaigns. In fact, the very disagreement works as a resource for him to provide an alternative position. Let us look at how the identity is used to bring off his alternative position.

Letter no. 59

Sir: I was appalled by the discourtesy to the Queen and her guest, Emperor Akihito of Japan. Arthur Titherington, chairman of the Japanese Labour Camps Survivors' Association, who has been given almost unlimited coverage to express his opinions, does not speak for all Far East prisoners of war.

I also worked on the Thai-Burma railway, at Sonkurai, where 1,200 out of 1,600 were dead within three months. I agreed to take part in an escape attempt to let the outside world know how prisoners worked and died. I am now the only survivor of such attempt from Thailand. Five died on our escape. After being taken for execution, but saved by the intervention of Colonel Cyril Wild, I was sentenced to eight year's penal servitude in Outram Road Jail.

I still have nightmares, but these are not caused by the present or immediate past generation of Japanese. We have reached a time, finally, to forgive, even though it is impossible to forget. The future is all important.

JAMES BRADLEY
Winchester

In the letter's opening the writer claimed reaction to the protest ("I was appalled to the Queen and her guest, Emperor Akihito of Japan") declares his position in opposition to the ex-POWs groups whose protests were featured in the media coverage. His claim provides a basis opposing the views of those of the protested POW groups. Here these monarchical figures, despite their once enemy status during the WWII, are placed on the equal footing ("the Queen and her guest, the Emperor Akihito of Japan"). This in effect places Arthur Titherington, the chairman of the veteran's group in opposition to his position aligned with the Queen and the emperor. Although the writer's identity is not yet fully revealed at this point, this opening expresses the author's challenge to the view widely reported in the media, pointing out the media's bias in covering the event ("unlimited coverage"). The identity of the letter ("Far East prisoners of war") is made available by expressing "his majority" view in contrast to the minority view of the veteran's group, which ironically receive more media coverage.

How is his counter argument put forward as a majority's (and accurate) view of the rest of the Far East prisoners of war? Following from the author's overt disagreement to the media-friendly view of the veteran's group, a narrative of personal experience is mobilised to claim entitlement to the experience (Sacks, 1992d) and undermine the view represented by Titherington and his colleagues. A brief description of a setting in this narrative termed as "scene setting" (Buchanan and Middleton, 1995)—"I also worked on the Thai-Burma railway" formulates a location of the unfolding narrative event. The exact place and the number of death are formulated, which account as hard evidence. A specific name of the location, "at Sonkurai," constitutes a place where this problematic event ("1,200 out of 1,600 death within three months) happened. Also, this death count within a particular period works to imply the serverity of the living condition and treatment received at the camp. The number figure, although rounded off approximation, is specific enough to be presented as evidence of war time atrocities, constitutes this narrative as a factual account of the past.

Having established the circumstances of the captivity, the rest of the letter is built on the circumstances accounting for his survival from the captivity. Furthermore, the significance of the survival is produced as a result of the escape

attempt in which he actively and voluntarily took part ("I agreed to take part in an escape attempt"). This provides the motive for why he took the risk of taking part in an escape attempt ("to let the outside world know how prisoners worked and died"). The description of his actions both in the war-time past (escape attempt) and in the present (writing this letter) are offered as a way of accounting for his motive of writing the letter. His telling of the experience of captivity and survival entitles him to bear witness to the servitude and magnitude of the experience of captivity. His escape attempt is revealed in term of the risks taken and the consequent punishments of imprisonment ("After being taken for execution, but saved by the intervention of Colonel Cyril Wild, I was sentenced to eight years' penal servitude in Outram Road jail"). This narrative is produced as a lived experience of a POW to account for his own survival from the experience of captivity and imprisonment.

His narrative of the captivity not only accounts for his present predicament, but also provides a context where his willingness to forgive and plea for reconciliation are warranted without having to blame present-day Japanese persons or groups ("We have reached a time, finally, to forgive, even though it is impossible to forget"). The last paragraph offers his conclusion and proposal for reconciliation. For him to propose reconciliation is highly contentious as it does not ally with a popular view of the ex-POW. Under this constraint, he manages his two contrasting positions through the use of his ex-POW identity, which legitimises his claim of suffering from nightmares on one hand. On the other, despite the lasting negative effect of the past, he does not impute blame to the Japanese for his suffering and proposes forgiveness ("but these are not caused by the present or immediate past generation of Japanese."). These two contrasting positions show what Billig calls as "ideological dilemma (1989; 1990; 1991; 1996; Billig, Condor et al., 1988). Instead of presenting a straightforward disagreement with the majority of the ex-POW veterans, his rhetorically worked up dilemma, incorporating two contrasting positions, manages a problematic consequence of proposing forgiveness and reconciliation. To conclude, the last statement, "the future is all important" wards off a potential counter-argument and oppositions by other ex-POW veterans.

As the analysis shows, making a proposal for forgiveness and reconciliation is not a straightforward discursive business, which exemplifies the basis for reconciliation as discursive accomplishment. The ex-POW letter writer works up

sensitively his proposal for forgiveness and reconciliation as he attends to a delicate nature of the consequence of advocating forgiveness and reconciliation.

Managing positions to achieve neutrality

The following letter (No. 60) is written by a Japanese expatriate (in fact it is a woman judging from the name[1]). It offers a Japanese point of view on reconciliation. As in the previous letter (No. 59), the letter opens with a nomination of a particular identity, "a Japanese national." It sets up a line of argument aligned with the identity of the Japanese national. Note that fronting up this identity has dangerous implications considering the nature of the debate. Let us examine how the writer manages this potentially problematic identity to express her view on reconciliation. The key analytical concept here is management of neutrality (Clayman, 1992; Drew and Heritage, 1992). The letter manages neutrality of her position as it mobilises two versions of national history in modern era, displaying her understanding of how nationalism is the root cause of the WWII, into which these two nations were brought. In order to distance her and ward off any potential counter-argument, personal agency is removed. Instead, agency is assigned to non-human categories of ideological and historical explanations. Such use of non-human discursive resources distance the writer from the problematic identity of Japanese (Potter, 1996; Potter and Wetherell, 1987). Let us look more closely as to how the identity of "a Japanese national" is handled as the letter writer mobilises modern history of Japan and Britain.

Letter no. 60

Sir: As a Japanese national who
has lived in Britain for over 17
years I was surprised by Tony
Blair's statement regarding the
POW problem. It is sad that
economic necessity has overruled
the suffering that the POW and
internees experiences. However,
it is equally sad that the British
right-wing media has hijacked the
POW issue and used it as a stick
to beat Japan.
            Neither country can take the

---

[1] This knowledge is available to the Japanese speaking analyst, who resides in Britain. From the signed name of the writer, it suggests that the writer is female.

moral high ground; Japan because of the atrocities committed by its soldiers during and before the Second World War, and Britain because of its poor record in Ireland, India and China during the years of the British Empire.

The real crime in this affair is the crime of nationalism. Japan was a poor country at the beginning of the 20th century and was desperate to catch up with Western nations. It utilised nationalism and imperialism as tools to achieve industrialisation, a process which brutalised the common Japanese worker, who was forced to work extremely hard for minimum reward and in the harshest of conditions. The Emperor was used as an icon to concentrate the spiritual energy of the nation, to justify the hardship and also the plundering of other nations. The pathological atrocities perpetrated by the Japanese soldiers illustrate the intensity of this totalitarian regime, under which the Japanese people also suffered.

Why not call it quits and forget it? Because those who forget the past are condemned to repeat it. The way forward for Japan is to start teaching the young people in school exactly what went on during the war. They are being extremely complacent by not doing so. We cannot turn a new leaf without coming to terms with the past.
TOKUKO HASHIMOTO
Editor
Eikoku News Digest
London E2

The letter speaks from the position of a Japanese expatriate, "a Japanese national who has lived in Britain for over 17 years." Here the writer's residential status of

considerable duration in Britain seems to claim her culturally informed and competent position to speak of her view of reconciliation. However, her Japanese nationality, her view can be easily dismissed if it single-handedly supports Tony Blair's economic necessity argument. So, the use of this identity demands a different rhetorical work to endorse her view of reconciliation. The letter as a whole manages her neutral position on the POW debate. Her emotional reaction ("I was surprised" and "it was sad") to Tony Blair's weighing "the economic necessity" formulates her as a competent judge who objectively considers the merits of both arguments. These two opposing arguments—"the economic necessity" and "the suffering of the POWs" represent social, economic and moral values in Britain and are expressed in dilemmatic terms where future prospect and recognition of the past are in conflict (Billig, Condor et al., 1988). Acknowledging equal importance of the two sides, the writer not only presents herself beyond her national identity, as a thoughtful, rational individual but also a concerned moral being.

However, neither one of the arguments is favoured over the other. Instead, the media is blamed for the present debate and controversy ("However, it is equally sad that the British right-wing media has hijacked the POW issue and used it as a stick to beat Japan"). The ascription of her emotion to criticism of British media deflects the potential counter-arguments, which would attack her identity of "a Japanese national." Neutrality of her position is achieved by circumventing the blame to the media. The British media is portrayed with violent metaphors ("highjack the POW issue...use it as a stick to beat Japan") and unfair as if it steers public opinions for denigrating Japan.

For her, both Japan and Britain are equally blame-worthy. The argument is resourced in histories of the two countries in the modern era, highlighting the "record" of atrocities and violence of which Japan and Britain are known in modern history ("during and before") and ("Ireland, India and China during the years of the British Empire). By putting Japan and Britain on equal footing on the poor moral ground ("Neither country can take the moral high ground"), the neutrality of her position is maintained from potential counter-arguments. Imputation of blame to nationalism as "the real crime" lets the two countries off the hook from being the guilty party for violence and aggression in modern history. She goes on to produce her historical analysis of the Japanese soldiers' perpetrated atrocities. Their perpetrated atrocities are formulated as natural and unavoidable, attributing to abnormal disease-like

conditions and circumstances ("pathological"). According to her, this pathological state is originated in the social system to which the Japanese-at-large were subjected "the intensity of this totalitarian regime under which the Japanese people also suffered." Because in her argument it is a sickness, the atrocities are constructed as symptomatic of ideology (e.g., nationalism, etc.) and therefore, the soldiers conduct of violence becomes less culpable, if not at all, excusable. Her narrative of modern Japanese history removes culpability from the soldiers themselves and locates blame within ideological force of nationalism, which makes it very difficult to demand any retributions due to its lack of active agency.

The mobilisation of the nation's past affords a form of reasoning, which permits a causal explanation of why these atrocities and violence occurred. Nationalism, imperialism, westernisation, industrialisation and the like do not attribute active agency of who practices them, the nationalist, imperialist, colonialist and the like. The Japanese people are constructed as a will-less, self-less, machine like non-human agency that ended up being a victim of such ideology and its social system. Similarly, the Emperor, unlike the popular portrayal as war criminal, is constituted as a passive entity without human agency ("the Emperor was used as an icon"). The two nations' recent pasts are presented in terms of victims of history and ideology. The thrust of her argument for reconciliation is resourced in the rhetorical work of maintaining neutrality with the use of national history.

In this section, by analysing two letters, I have highlighted the performative nature of identity as to how letter writers' use of their identities resources for the social action of advocating forgiveness and reconciliation. Specifically managing two contrasting positions as in the form of ideological dilemma and maintaining neutrality and distancing are main features of the rhetorical work. In the next section, I will elaborate on the performative nature of identity and show how the blaming and demand for apology is resourced rhetorically in the letter writer's use of identity.

Identity-in-action and apology

Discursive act of blaming

The analysis of the following letter (Letter no. 61) will illustrate how discursive act of blaming gets accomplished by using the identity of 'war veteran'. Our focus is on the

descriptions of 'war veteran' and rhetorical organisation of those descriptions to do blaming.

Letter no. 61

Sir: As a war veteran myself, one
of whose school chums was
tortured and beheaded by his
Japanese captors for the "crime"
of attempting to defend his
country against a ruthless
invading army described by Sir
Donald Maitland (letter, 25 May)
as "brave and skilful" (a plaudit
equally applicable to the Nazi
SS), I have a confession to make.
            I don't hate the
Japanese, some 80 per cent of
whom were either born after
the
war, or too late to take any part
in it. But I have little time
either
for those who concealed their
bestial war record for so long
from their own children, and
who think that saying "sorry"
somehow heals the shattered
lives and bodies of our
miserably recompensed heroes
who stood against them, and
whom we now treat so
shamefully.
LEN CLARKE
Uxbridge, Middlesex

Mobilisation of Identity: War Veteran and chum

The letter starts by using the identity of 'war veteran.' The choice, 'war veteran' establishes an entitlement to participate publicly in this debate and express views in the letter. Nominating the identity of a 'war veteran,' provides for formulation of implicit blame towards particular segments of Japanese and British people. The term 'war veteran' is a category and its descriptions are a "category-bound activities" (Sacks, 1992b/1995) which are associated to certain experiences and characteristics of being a 'war veteran.'

This opening expression, 'war veteran,' affords a range of plausible conclusions concerning the writer's past experiences and activities in military service during a period of conflict. However, this opening also affords a range of other interpretations concerning what the writer may not have been. We may reasonably infer that the writer fought in W.W.II, but it does not necessarily mean that he was a POW himself captured in the Far East, nor that he worked on the Thai-Burma Railway. The identity of war veteran draws on a set of category-bound activities that permit the reader to assume his past without direct reference to missing specific information about the status (e.g., rank) and the degree of his involvement in the war (i.e., which war, time, duration and location of service, etc.).

Clarke's account of Japanese soldiers' atrocity ('tortured and beheaded') relies on his personal association to the person 'chum.' The word 'chum' or 'school chum' is note-worthy. It invokes cultural meaning in relation to the sort of experiences to which this term is oriented.[2] Also, Clarke's use of his chum's experience may be identified as discursive practice of footing (Goffman, 1981; Potter, 1996), that is to deploy a "relationship(s) that speakers and writers have to the descriptions they report (Potter, 1996, pp. 122-4). In making his own claims (or reporting claims of others), it displays various degrees of distance from what is reported (Potter, 1996). Referring to his dead pal as 'chum' evokes a sentiment situated in a particular time in the past and experience within a particular social and institutional setting (e.g., school). It is the discursively mobilised resource of his chum's war experience – he was tortured and beheaded – that demonstrates troubling features of Japanese soldiers.

Again, as in the use of the identity 'war veteran,' 'chum' is ambiguous in terms of the exact status of Clarke's acquaintance with this person. It does not declare the nature of closeness and contact. 'Chum' opens up a wider range of possible affiliations, and therefore, leaves open the exact status of the relationship. Likewise, the exact circumstances in which Clarke learned of the chum's death (e.g., whether Clarke was a witness at the scene or not) remains unstated. The use of 'chum' rhetorically resources Clarke's blaming of the Japanese soldiers. What we would like to stress here is the power that lies in using the term 'chum' makes the writer identity 'war veteran' relevant. However, it opens up the possibility that the person referred to was not necessarily a close friend of the writer. So, there is still work to do.

Whilst the description of 'school chum,' provides for the loss as personally significant, the description 'tortured and beheaded' builds the magnitude of this personal loss. It evokes a brutal process resulting in his chum's death, signalling intentional killing in extreme circumstances by the Japanese 'captors.' The use of 'school chum,' combined with the description of how he died, rhetorically achieves the horror of the reported events. This in turn contributes to vivid ruthlessness concerning character formulation of the 'Japanese captors.' Publicly acknowledged bravery and skill are discounted as honourable attributes.[3] Clarke's identity as 'war veteran' mobilising the notion of the victim from the "chum", who died in the horrifying manner described, provides the rhetorical basis for blame and the culpability of the Japanese. The ascription of blame and culpability is of course a contentious issue. Let us now examine how this is provided for in the rhetorical organisation of the letter.

Formulation of culpability

Killing the enemy in war is what soldiers do. It is a normative action at any war. How is the culpability of the Japanese army formulated in relation to the presented atrocity account? Here a 'crime' metaphor is used in establishing the status of his chum's death, who 'was tortured and beheaded by his Japanese captor for the crime of attempting to defend his country against a ruthless invading army...' Also, 'attempting to defend' suggests some level of failure on his action. The effect of crime metaphor (e.g., a set of words such as 'captor,' 'ruthless invading') formulates troubling aspects of the Japanese army, linking the description of action ('captor,' 'invading') with character formulation ('ruthless'). Thus, it allows the imputation of culpability to the Japanese with an implicit claim that the Japanese soldiers are responsible for the death of his chum.

Let us focus on an interesting contrast being made here. That is "ordinary" versus "extraordinary"—a soldier (i.e., Clarke's chum) doing an ordinary act of defending his country in contrast to the ruthless way of his death (i.e., he was tortured and beheaded). It is this contrast of an ordinary action of his chum, a soldier defending his country and an extraordinary way of being killed. It is the violent

---

[2] In standardised usage of British English according to Oxford English Dictionary (1996), the word, chum is defined as follows: (1) a close friend, especially among schoolchildren; (2) often followed by with shared rooms.

punishment for what the soldier normally does, to defend his country, which the letter makes relevant. This contrast of ordinary and extraordinary provides a moral basis of the Japanese army's culpability, something that should not have happened, even in the circumstances of war. The contrast of ordinary and extraordinary lends itself to character formulation—inexplicable cruelty in the way in which the Japanese soldiers handled ordinary soldiers, deserving Clarke's blaming and indignation (along with many other vociferous POWs whose position was covered in the media). Billig (1990) examines within family discourse about the British Royal Family how contrast between the status of people as ordinary and extraordinary provides argumentative resources in joint remembering of shared experiences. Similarly, the contrast between the ordinary status of being a soldier and the extraordinary circumstances of his death are used in the letter to work imputations of blame. The contrast of ordinary versus extraordinary generates a rhetorical effect of horror in the chum's experience.

Another contrast is found in the statement 'a ruthless invading army described by Sir Donald Maitland (letter, 25 May) as "brave and skilful" (a plaudit equally applicable to the Nazi SS).' We would like to point out that mobilisation of Sir Maitland's letter (that was published a few days earlier in the letters page in the same newspaper) reinforces the characterisation of the Japanese army' ruthlessness. In other words, Clarke, by quoting from Sir Maitland's letter, accepts Maitland's evaluation of the Japanese army as being 'brave and skilful.' Note that the quote is presented with a full citation of the date of publication (i.e., May 25) and of the letter writer's full name and the title, Sir, (a title acquired either by heredity or service to society) treating Maitland's characterisation of the Japanese army—'brave and skilful' as publicly acknowledged person's credible evaluation. Clarke for a moment aligned himself with Maitland's evaluation, but then immediately discounts it as dishonourable attributes by mobilising the parenthetical remark, 'a plaudit equally applicable to the Nazi SS.' This works by implication that Clarke grants to the Japanese army the same status as the Nazi, the epitome of atrocious perpetration and despicable acts, pre-empting the 'brave and skilful' with a violent characterisation.

In addition, the mobilisation of the letter written by a publicly acknowledged figure and use of the quote contributes to build the writer's (Clarke's) rationality in the discursive act of blaming. It shows Clarke's open-mindedness as a war veteran,

---

[3] Bravery and skill are not presented as qualities that mark out actions as necessarily honourable in the way the "defence" of country is designated in this context.

who is willing to grant attributes made by someone like Maitland, who had glorified the Japanese army as 'brave and skilful.' The writer's rationality displayed here works to achieve virtue as a war veteran along with other devices. In the next section, we shall identify those other devices and demonstrate how they help to constitute Clarke's virtue and functions in relation to his discursive act of blaming.

Stake Management

One might wonder what the following statement 'I have a confession to make,' does in relation to working up issues of blame? Other than observing an obvious prefacing to the new (possibly antithetical) argument which is about to be brought in, what does it accomplish? In discourse (and conversation) analytic perspective adopted here, the analytical focus is on 'sequential' organisation of descriptions in talk and text. As Potter and Wetherell (1987, p.93) argue "accounts will be best understood in looking at their positioning in sequences of discourse performing different kinds of act." The significance of this preface ('have a confession to make') is best understood by looking at how the subsequent part is organised and what is made relevant.

As shown earlier, the writer's identity as war veteran does not merely position himself according to the identity he nominates, but rather it is predicated in an array of descriptions. In so doing, it establishes the writer's credibility to express views in writing the letter, locates blames, and criticises other person's. This initial discursive work provides the context in which a 'confession' is made. In addition, it also works up an entitlement so to do in terms of the writer's stake in these events and current position in writing the letter. The word 'confession' connotes something personal as if truth were to be revealed. It announces possible norm breaking in having done something drastic or shocking, or perhaps counter to some declared position.

Importantly, 'confession' here does not seem to follow a conventional use. Confession is appropriate when an admission of sanctionable actions is at hand, or when someone wishes to expiate guilt or in a religious context some notion of 'sin'. Note however what is written in the subsequent sentence, 'I do not hate the Japanese.' This acknowledges a normative way of looking at the Japanese, as if the Japanese by default were to be hated. This normative view about the Japanese is substantiated by what was written earlier from a position of a war veteran claiming a personal loss of an acquaintance. Hence, the declaration that 'I do not hate the Japanese' re-configures the unusual position as a war veteran as being somewhat less anti-Japanese (if not

pro-Japanese). In so doing, the virtue of the writer is established, that is, to defy a stereotype of bitter war veteran. The writer is positioned as someone not making hasty generalisations about Japanese people even though his chum was killed by the Japanese. The consequent declaration of not hating despite the claimed status of his experience is also supported by the assertion that 'some 80 per cent of whom [the Japanese] were either born after the war, or too late to take any part in it.' The virtue and rationality of the writer's position is accomplished in terms of the management of his stake and interest in this topic.

The writer's virtue is worked up in the earlier descriptions such the war veteran, chum, the commentary on Sir Mainland and his position and circumstances of contemporary debate and events. This is what is called 'stake management' in a discursive analytic perspective (Edwards and Potter 1992; Potter, 1996). Clarke is denying a dangerous implication generated by 'war veteran' and 'chum,' that his judgement may be clouded, prejudiced, and distorted by his involvement, rather than underwritten by it. His virtue and rationality once established, rhetorically resource the business of blaming. In addition the sequential positioning of the "confession" accomplishes more than just the management of stake and interest in writing the letter. It provides the discursive context for presenting his imputations of blame to particular segments of the Japanese "who concealed their bestial war record" and those (by implication both Japanese and British) "who think that saying "sorry" somehow heals the shattered lives and bodies of our miserably recompensed heroes who stood against them, and whom we now treat so shamefully."

Apology as a topic of concern

Having examined how the writer works to establish the virtue and rationality of his position we can look in more detail how the writer discursively attributes blame to the Japanese in the current controversy. Of particular interest is the way the notion of apology is deployed. The ambiguity concerning just which nationality should be apologising for what is interesting. Clearly the sequential positioning of the "those who conceal their bestial war record" makes the Japanese who were part of the war the subject of concern. By doing so, his blame is placed not only on the Japanese army, but also on Japanese authorities (e.g., government and educators) who do not openly make war-time records and publications available to the general public, especially the Japanese youth.

However, just "who" should be apologising for the inadequate compensation in connection with damaged lives of war heroes is opened up discursively to include both the Japanese and the British. Here, a reference is made to people such as Sir Maitland and the British people at large who are willing to move on toward the future, opting for reconciliation where the suffering of the POWs is no longer an issue of contention. Blame centres on the notion of forgotten heroes. In other words, those ex-POWs who fought for their country in the Far East have been forgotten. It asserts a lack of general public's acknowledgement of the POWs contributions to war efforts in post-war Britain. The next letter (Letter no. 64) makes an explicit issue of apology as a topic of concern with the current status of handling of the war-time atrocities. With this letter, I will focus on the way in which the writer's identity claims an entitlement to the experience that he could not have had.

Accounting motive and moral accountability

The letter no. 64 provides an interesting case where the letter writer claims his argumentative position through hear-say account of other people's experience. This has a potentially problematic implication to the way he claims his position regarding the demand for apology. The letter writer uses the identity of his kin, his uncle, to claim his entitlement to speak of his view.

Letter no. 64

Sir: I travelled from Australia specif-
ically to attend the protest against the
Japanese Emperor. My uncle died
in a PoW camp in 1943. According
to his pals who survived he was treat-
ed inhumanly. As I am his closest liv-
ing relative I feel duty-bound to
represent what I believe he would do
were he able. I am not driven by a
desire for "blood-money". A simply
apology would suffice.
JOE O'BRIEN
Milnrow,
Greater Manchester

The first question to ask is how the writer establishes his credibility and entitlement to write a letter on this topic? His participation in the protest is used to convey his serious attitude toward this debate. In particular, referring to how far he travelled, the

travel is formulated as a purposeful act of taking part in the protest against the Japanese Emperor ("I travelled from Australia specifically..."). One might wonder how he justified the long trip from Australia. The following sets up a warrant for his participation in the protest as he goes on to describe his uncle's death at the PoW camp in 1943. It is the death of his uncle and the circumstances that led him to death ("he was inhumanely treated"), of which the writer later was informed by his uncle's pals. This hearsay account of his uncle's death justifies his blaming of the Japanese. However, the status of his knowledge concerning his uncle's death is on a shaky ground. How then is his motive worked up to justify the long distance travel?

Although his participation in the protest seems to be a morally warrantable action on the part of a family member, whose kin died in the PoW camp, there lies a problematic implication. That is, the writer needs to account for his motive of attending the protest. One may wonder how he could justify a long distance travel for a moral cause such as a family relative's allegedly unrecompensed death. One might even conceive a possibility of some veteran's organisation financially backing up his travel. His motive, in fact, is immediately and explicitly attended in the ensuing description. It is constituted as duty not mere his physical presence of his uncle's behalf ("I feel duty-bound to represent what I believe he would do were he able") and denying the possible motive for financial gain ("I am not driven by a desire for "blood-money"). This letter is a case where the writer's demand for apology is warranted without having to have a direct experience of war or even the captivity. It is through this inherited experience of someone related as a closest kin and the reported account of his death that the inhuman treatment in the camp is held morally accountable. Therefore, his demand for apology, "simply apology would suffice" constitutes moral accountability of his own participation in the protest.

Implicitly invoked cultural and ethnic identity

Writers' names can be a discursive device to deploy a cultural-ethnic identity in representing a particular position. The letter no. 62 does not reveal explicitly the writer's ethnic identity in the letter text itself, unlike in the letter no. 60 where the writer's cultural/ethnic identity is nominated and made relevant to her argumentative position. How then does the letter no. 62 make a particular identity relevant despite its seeming absence of the identity description? Rather than blaming a particular person or group, this letter points out the double standard of some of the stake holders in this

debate with respect to the issue of apology in the debate. A signed name at the end can be part of the work of identity accomplished to condemn those who have double standard. Let us see how a short letter such as this would perform a powerful identity work:

Letter no. 62

Sir: I have every sympathy for
the experiences endured for the
former PoWs. However, the
Japanese government has already
apologised, which Emperor
Akihito cannot do because of his
constitutional position. During
the Queen's visit to Punjab last
year, no apology was made for
the Amritsar massacre.
BALRAJ SINGH GILL
Slough,
Berkshire

The letter begins with the writer's preface to an ensuing disagreement ("I have every sympathy for the experiences endured for the former POWs. However, ...") (Mulkay, 1985). The letter argues the irrelevance of debating over the status of apology by Japanese government in two accounts: first, the apology has been made by the Japanese government; second, the constitutional position of the Emperor prevents him from making an apology, insisting a pointlessness of demanding an apology from some who is not given the political authority to do so. The writer's point on Japan's status of apology hinges on the double standard of Britain, that is, the Queen's failure of making apology on the Amritsar massacre. He draws a parallel case of the Japanese Emperor's visit to the Queen's visit to Punjab in terms of how the issue of apology was handled in the context of a recent royal visit. The writer is pointing out his own government's hypocrisy concerning apology on the Amritsar massacre by reference to the Queen failure to apologise in her visit to Punjab. Here, this historical event, the Amritsar massacre, establishes a reasonable link to the writer's identity as Sikh, which is evident from the signed name, Balraj Singh Gill. The letter's argumentative position is resourced in mobilisation of the crucial historical event such as the Amritsar massacre and its links to his Sikh identity made available in the form of writer's signature.

Text vs. talk

Another issue to consider in a similar vein is the analysability of the text such as these letters. Some scholars of Ethnomethodology, Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis maintain that conversational data (e.g., "mundane" everyday conversations recorded for analysis or solicited conversations such as interviews and focus groups discussions) are the primary form of human interactions and therefore the most worthy of analytical attention. The basis for giving primacy to talk data has to do with the way turn taking is organised (e.g., adjacency pairs Nosfinger, 1991) and how such organisation provides an empirical base for explicating discursive actions and members' method of understanding of how the world works. Apparently, text data is deficient in sequential organisation of turn taking. We can only see the upshot of the first utterance as to how it was understood through reading the next turn. Taking these into account, I have done some justice to these letters in order to tease out discursive analytic concepts, and they were followed up and elaborated further in using the interview talk material. In this thesis, text and talk data are treated as complementary with one another, highlighting similar theoretical issues of reconciliation as well as the analytical concept of accountability within the context of the overall framework of the thesis. Instead of retreating from the limitations of analysability of the text, I use them as a way into exploring further the issues defined in this chapter and set out to analyse talk data.

Although there is no way of knowing how these seven letters were assembled to fit into one newspaper's page, it is intriguing to see the following letters are put in sequence (in following a convention of reading in a vertical direction and from left to right). The following two letters seem to be making a connected argument in addressing the irrelevance of taking individual responsibility, followed by a letter addressing a problem of being associated with an organisation in response to the staged protest. Both letters seem to show the interdependency of personal and collective significance of the past in the present circumstances.

Accountability of the personal and collective significant past

The letter no. 65 insists the irrelevance of blaming the present day Japanese for the "ancestor's crimes" as they were not directly involved in the war atrocities. The following example is a case of how people take accountability of past actions (such as war atrocities) with either personal or public/collective relevance:

Letter no. 65

Sir: The vast majority of people in
Japan today were not even born un-
til after the atrocities. If we are to
hold people responsible for their an-
cestors' crimes, then we, the British
people, will spend the best part of
the rest of our lives apologising. I
don't accept responsibility for the
slave trade or any of the countless
crimes committed by British citizens
under the banner of imperialism.
CHRISTOPHER WRIGHT
Reading, Berkshire

In this letter, the writer expresses a problem of blaming others and making them accountable for the past violence that they themselves did not take part in. He argues that that the war atrocities and crimes do not carry over to the posterity of the nation. In so doing, he denies his individual accountability, insisting on the irrelevance of holding the present-day Japanese responsible for the "ancestors' crimes." Two categories of people emerge here: the past generation (i.e. people who were living at the time of event and the present generation (i.e., people who were born after the event). The writer, declaring his British citizenship, challenges the way some people have accused the present-day Japanese for the war-time atrocities. He draws a parallel case where such accusation to a particular nationality group is an unfair indictment of the people who do not hold personal accountability just as the past atrocities and ancestor's crimes of Britain does not make him or the present day British people at large responsible.

The issue of accountability in the letters page is addressed in two accounts—whether the past at issue is relevant to the life of an individual, or to a nation and its people as a group or community of people who share the same past or history in time and place. The following letter seems to address this tension or interdependency between the private and public dimensions of accountability as to how accountability is taken up in terms of this interdependency.

Letter no. 63

Sir: As a person of uniform, I tend

> to clip all pictures of people wear-
> ing them for my files. But today (27
> May) I do not intend to keep your
> front page picture, as I do not wish to
> embarrass member of the Roy-
> al Corps of Signals by preserving an
> image of the display of shocking bad
> manners by one of their number.
> MEGAN C ROBERTSON
> *Crewe, Cheshire*

The letter makes an implicit claim in which the other people's actions relating to the particular (recent) past (i.e., the protest and other events related to the POW debate) made a considerable impact on the letter writer's routine organisation of everyday activities (i.e., clipping all pictures of people wearing them [uniforms] for my [her] files"). By declaration of her identity "a student of uniform" the clipping of pictures is warranted as a norm of her daily activity (i.e., clipping pictures). The telling of her daily routine activity is not merely a report of what she does everyday. The activity is important to the identity because telling of this activity to others is a way of professing what it means to have such identity. For her it is an identity in which she certainly takes pride and honour. Therefore, the letter writer accuses the behaviours of the protesters because they do not keep up to the standard that she holds in terms of a public display of conduct as an armed-force service man/woman. Her expressed emotional reactions to the protest (i.e., embarrassment and shock) and assertion of intent (of not keeping those pictures of the men in the protest) makes a moral judgement about them for their lack of integrity. In so doing, she claims a damage of identity such that her routine activity is disrupted and her identity has been marred, holding them accountable for her marred identity. Her accusation is achieved in this very interdependency of private and public dimensions of consequences of the action, where her personal view of the other's action was brought in to the public arena in accountability of the actions relating to the particular past.

Summary of the analysis of the letters

The analysis of the letters illustrates the complex rhetorical businesses of blaming, proposing reconciliation, forgetting and forgiving as well as addressing implications for apology and reconciliation in the discursive context of writing a letter for public consumption. The analysis examines the ways in which those devices are put to use in presenting positions, opinions and motives concerning contentious issues in terms of

the organisation of texts and the mobilisation of rhetorical devices (e.g., narrative, stake management, accountability, rhetorical common places). For instance, with the discursive nomination of an identity as a war veteran the letter invokes a variety of descriptions that implicate a range of category-bound activities (e.g., what it is to be a soldier). Such category bound activities invoke particular relations to people, places and time (e.g., concerning the implications of friendship) and other socio-cultural and linguistic conventions of language (e.g., characteristics and activities of particular identities). Once a particular identity is explicitly nominated, its implications, ambiguities and relevance are delicately managed. This work of identity allows the letter to achieve social actions. For instance, blaming is worked up in the specific circumstances in which the letter discursively negotiates the meaning of apology and reconciliation. Furthermore, the formulations of blaming, plea for reconciliation and demand for apology, are not based on a pre-given mental construct, nor rule-governed semantics, nor derived from a set of linguistically pragmatic strategies that analysts and theorists draw upon. Instead, they are locally framed in the textual space of the letter. Letter writing is, therefore analysable as a discursive act of remembering, in which memories and identities relevant to W.W.II experiences are used communicatively in dealing with current and future consequences of past actions.

Identity-in-action and variability of opinions and views

My starting point in looking at these letters is to attend to its striking variability of which the letter writers' opinions and views vastly differ from one another. The writer's experiences in wartime and post-war lives are expressed in meta-cognitive verbs such as to remember, forget, blame, forgive, see, hear, know, believe, and feel are constituted as social actions of accountability. The letters contain strongly held opinions and views, and they seem to rely on the use of identity descriptions and their implications mobilised as rhetorical resources to perform social actions (e.g., demanding apology, seeking reconciliation, blaming, justifying, defending). These diverse social actions of discursive practices are the central focus of the thesis, that is, termed as accountability of the past actions and events.

Apology and Reconciliation

War apology and reconciliation constitute a major issue in the POW controversy. The question of whether the Japanese prime minister or emperor apologised has been

repeatedly debated among the ex-POWs, war veterans and those who have a vested interest in it. The letters to the editor in *The Independent* handle the issue of apology and reconciliation differently depending on the identity the letter writer uses and the way it is positioned in the debate. For instance, in Clarke's case the issue of apology is mobilised and framed in the rhetorical business of blaming the Japanese army and by criticising the ways the issue has been handled by the British people at large (including the British government, and the post-war generation). The main contention is that it is not simply a matter of the Japanese apologising, but how the apology issue is handled and made relevant by the British, and consequently turned into an issue of reconciliation in which everyone would seem to move forward and forget the past and the suffering of the POWs. The notion of apology and reconciliation (i.e., what apology is and should be and how it leads to reconciliation) is constructed in discursive texts through the process of accomplishing social actions—imputing blames, criticising and justifying, etc.

Inspection of letters raises a range of further analytical questions relevant to the future research. What constitutes apology and how is it constructed? How do different versions of apology produced and what is required of apology to make it culturally acceptable? Since apology is an issue of accountability, how do people account for past actions in the formulation of apology? And if 'saying sorry' is not enough as Clarke maintains, what else has to be said, in what way, when and by whom?

A recent study on apology focused on a cross-cultural misunderstanding between the UK and Japan (Murata, 1998). Murata analysed the situated use of apology in one linguistic community and demonstrated how differently a form of apology is interpreted in another. The context dependent nature of apology was revealed and its contribution to inter-cultural misunderstanding. Of her particular concern were contextual factors contributing to misunderstanding of the intent derived in a letter to the British government purportedly 'apologising' for the treatment of prisoner's of war. However the notion of apology also raises a whole range of other analytical concerns. For example, apology draws upon a rich lexicon of emotionally loaded terms e.g., remorse, regret, reflection, etc. Discursive psychology is particularly concerned with the analysis of emotion as a discursive accomplishment (see for example, Edwards, 1997). In addition, the production and recipiency of apology draws upon complex interdependencies between socially accomplished

identity and position, formality and informality, rituals and ceremonies. Whilst translation from one language to another also implicates contextual semantic and pragmatic matters the interactive organisation of apology as situationally accomplished is not directly analysed. Furthermore, framing apology as some resolution of "cultural misunderstanding" attributing to formalistically deduced linguistic differences results in assigning an analyst-generated category, detached from the local meaning.

The discursive approach advocated here examines the rhetorical organisation of apology in talk and texts. It focuses on action-orientated discursive practices, locally produced by the members whose stake and interests are represented. Of special interest is the way a particular version of apology fail to satisfy a recipient (Tavuchis, 1991; Trosborg, 1987)). Analysis of such failure tells us something about what constitutes apology. A 'cross-cultural misunderstanding' of apology, therefore, is an analytical resource for discourse analysts. It provides a basis for examining various consequences that are made relevant as not constituting a 'proper apology' and how these are made sense of and acted upon by participants in the discursive work of making and receiving apologies.

Accountability in social practices of reconciliation

What follows outlines key analytical issues that emerged from the present analysis and discussion. The letters analysed in this chapter are representative of discourse, a text for public consumption. The discursive analysis of the letter writers' use of identity in the letters occasioned in the 1998 Japanese emperor's visit have pointed out a few promising directions to examine some other accountability practices in social practices of reconciliation. Some promising directions involve consideration of social settings and community of people who live with this issue of reconciliation and apology as a topic of their live concern. Who are the people that are most likely to have positions on the issues of reconciliation and apology? What have they been doing in their post war lives with respect to reconciliation? What sort of intervention activities have brought change into their lives in terms of remembering (and forgetting) the wartime experiences?

In answering these questions and reflecting on the analysis of the letters, four main groups of stakeholders are identified: war-veterans, especially those who were taken as prisoners of war by the Japanese, Japanese expatriates in Britain, family

members of the veterans and ex-PoWs, and finally those whose cultural, ethnic, professional, or social identities were somehow at stake and provoked by the protests against the Emperor's visit. Particularly interesting here is a cross-cultural dimension of social practices of reconciliation. Letter writers' ethnic identity and cultural background are explicitly made relevant and positioned to perform a particular social action. The cross-cultural dimension concerns the ways in which the discourse users (e.g., letter writers) diffuse differences between themselves and cultural others. These differences do not exist *apriori*. They are socially constructed positions and accomplished discursively *in situ*. In order to study the locally emerging moment-by-moment accomplishment of social actions, interview talk was studied in terms of how the interviewer and interviewees make their ethnic and cultural orientations significant (or not significant). Displaying such orientation discursively demands interlocutors' sensitivity to the notion of cultural otherness. In this sense, the interview is not just an occasion for a researcher to get field data, but comprises a discursive space where reconciliation is discursively accomplished locally and moment-by-moment by interlocutors as they attend to those cultural issues as topic. Social reconciliation is therefore studiable as the analysis orients to the very concerns of the interlocutors and explicates how interactionally such issues as cultural-ness and ethnic identities and their differences are brought off within the context of the reconciliation interview.

Another emergent issue of the analysis of the letters is accountability practices with respect time and change. Letter writers mobilise narratives and historical accounts of the past to describe what it is to live in a particular period of the past. In his plea for reconciliation, the former POW letter writer mobilised a narrative of his captivity and survival and displayed his credibility. The other former POW letter writer used his friend's experience to do blaming and demand apology. The Japanese expatiate writer mobilised her gloss on the contemporary Japanese history and offered an explanation of the cause of the Japanese soldiers' violence and atrocities committed during the war. These narratives of the past include collectively shared history or personal account of the past. They immediately invoke a certain set of features, meaning and characteristics of the past events and actions, making the past available in the present discursive context and setting. They also account for change (or consistency) of the writer's disposition toward reconciliation and apology by offering identity descriptions at a particular time of the past. Narratives are powerful

rhetorical tools for accounting for how things were in the past and what it is (was) to do reconciliation.

The discourse approach and analysis of accountability set out to examine these issues—the cross-cultural dimension, time and change within the context of social organisation of remembering. However, to investigate a locally produced understanding of how the world is (or was) *in situ* as an interactional accomplishment, the letters and other textual materials fall short in providing examples of sequential organisation and turn-taking where discourse users take part in local production of knowledge and meaning in naturally occurring talk.

The next three chapters form a trilogy of analyses concerning the former British prisoners of war's accountability practices—accounting for others, accounting for the past, and accounting for change in social organisation of remembering and talk about their reconciliation experiences. As with the letters, the interview talk comprises a discursive practice of social actions, where the controversial issues of reconciliation and apology are brought off and handled interactionally, and thus forms the primary data source for the analysis. Reconciliation is not only a topic of interview talk, but also is accomplished interactionally. These chapters sharpen the analytic focus on the discursive practices of reconciliation. The analytic questions are: how interviewees address the problems of the past, in particular with a rice diet at the camp, communication with Japanese guards at the POW camp, and how they claim to have changed their attitude toward the Japanese, and how they attribute the change to their participation in the reconciliation trip. Interview talk provides further evidence of how they do reconciliation discursively.

CHAPTER 4

Accounting for others: Sensitivity and ethnification in talk

Introduction

This chapter explores the notion of social accountability in studying communicative actions observed in activities of reconciliation and social remembering. In particular it is concerned with the notion of social accountability, that is, how parties in the interviews are mutually accountable. The key issue here is the interaction management—how people explicitly produce an account for past events and actions. The specific analytic tasks are to examine ways in which those accounts are produced sensitively with use of humour, irony, and with production of laughter. In other words, how do people produce blamings and accusations in ways that maintain a conversational project that does not go into disrepair? The empirical issues are therefore the interactional management of sensitivity and social construction of amicability in talk vis-à-vis the Japanese interviewer, the cultural other for the British ex-POW participants. A significant analytic task is to examine construction of cultural otherness by asking how people produce an account for others of different cultural and ethnic origin and how the participants' use of their identities and positions accomplish social actions, in particular, claiming problems involving living in captivity as Prisoners of war. The chapter examines the ways in which people talk about others, in particular those of different cultures or ethnic origins in the context of former British POWs discussing their experiences of reconciliation. The examination of such talk further develops the argument concerning the discursive accomplishment of reconciliation.

The interview talk on reconciliation between the former British prisoners of war and the Japanese interviewer poses some interactional challenges and difficulties in terms of managing a potentially contentious talk. On the one hand, both participants work discursively on sustaining amicable interactional relations with one another. On the other hand, they use identity positions and cultural knowledge as discursive resource to produce critical comments on the cultural practices of others. In using discourse examples from the interviews with the ex-POWs, who recently

returned to Japan for a reconciliation trip, the analysis focuses on several features of talk in terms of interactional management of sensitivity. First, I will look at the use of humour and irony in talk and how they mitigate tension between the interlocutors as they orient to and ward off a potential conflict. Second, the role of laughter is considered in terms of how laughter is socially organised and designed to achieve participants-recipients' shared understanding of the past in their uptakes. The analysis illustrates a moderating role of laughter with respect to initiation and uptake of laughter. It will unfold the process of "trouble telling" (Jefferson, 1988). It also shows how speaker's and recipients troubles and problems are expressed in terms of an interactional mechanism termed as "recipient design." The third feature is the process of ethnification. The notion of ethnification has been studied in talk in a cross-cultural context (Moerman, 1973; 1974). The examination of ethnification allows us to look at "ethnic identity as a situated accomplishment of interlocutors" (Day, 1994; Day, 1998). For this, I will look at how cultural otherness is constituted and put to use in talk. I will show ways in which culture was made to be an interactional topic of concern as the POWs accounted for the war time past and offered their position of reconciliation.

From a systematic observation of a large corpus of data gathered for the study, certain topics and experiences were found to be recurrently talked about by the former POWs in the interviews. Such topics included food and eating practices in camps, especially rice and a rice diet. It seems that the events and experiences related to rice are central to the POW life and emblematic of the culture of the camp. Extracts used in this chapter concern conversational topics of rice and a rice diet. The ex-POWs' accounts of rice and a rice diet are used to mark the Japanese as cultural other and display their past and current understanding of the Japanese people and their cultural practices. The chapter's overall aim is to discuss how the topic of rice and a rice diet is brought off as a cultural emblematic category, and then used to accomplish specific social actions, that is to claim and account for the difficulty with the rice diet in the POW camp. Considering the contentious nature of the interview, discursive formulation and re-formulation of the cultural change and the dietary practice of cultural others has a direct implication to the thesis' overall argument, reconciliation as discursive accomplishment.

Participants and setting

This particular extract, Extract 1 was taken from five-hour recording of a group interview with those veterans who agreed to take part in my research and to discuss their views and experiences of reconciliation with respect to their captivity in the labour camps in Thailand and in Japan. The interview was conducted in a north-eastern city of England in spring 1999. The participants are four former prisoners of war who took part in the reconciliation trip in 1992 and two of their spouses. These two spouses did not accompany their partners on the reconciliation trip. The interviewer is the researcher herself.

Rice as emblematic category of culture of others

In the next extract, we will look at the use of the term "rice" and consider how rice invokes participant's experiences in a particular past. The analysis is concerned with a question of how a seemingly mundane topic of eating rice is brought off and establishes its relevance in the interaction. We will look at the uptake as to how the utterance "I went back for the rice" was treated by the participants as rice being an emblematic category of Japanese culture.

Extract 1: "I went back for the rice"

```
     1     Int.       Why did you decide (.) to go on this trip?
     2     Charlie:   Because [we
     3     Int.:              [Iruka trip
     4     Mary:              [(inaudible)
     5     Ted:       Why did we go back to Iruka?
     6     Int.:      Yes, yes.
     7     Charlie:   Well MY main reason of going back was to see
     8                (.) the graves of my friends who died in
     9                I:ruka. That was my main reason.
    10     Int.:      °hum°
    11     Charlie:   Eh, and to see what the uh (if there was)
    12                The cross was there and everything, but it
    13                Wasn't. Because the Japanese people they've
    14                Erected a mem_orial there (.) for the uh (.)
    15                The British troops who died there. And uh
    16                They made a good job of it I tell you.
    17                But when we↑ left the camp in forty five,
    18                We put a nice cross up (.) with a (.) a
    19                Plaque engraved with all the names. Those
    20                Sixteen lads died in Iruka (.) and that's
    21                What I went back for to see (.) the graves
    22                Of me friends. (.) I don't know about
    23                Anybody else (.) [>who would<
→   24     Sidney:                     [I went back for the rice.
    25     Ted:       [(inaudible) hhh
    26     Int.:      [Hehe hhhhhhh [heh
    27     Ray:                     [hehehehe
```

```
28    Charlie:   For the rice, [hah hah ha.
29    Ted:       Ex-man, Joe:seph, Joe:seph (inaudible)
30    Ray:       But they (don't) eat much rice now, do they?
31    Int:       Hehehehehehe [(inaudible) ((mumble))
32                            [hehehe hehe
33    Charlie:   But Joe went back like everybody else
34               He wanted to see old (.) (            )
```

In this exchange, rice is constituted as the food of the camp, invoking notions of starvation and malnutrition. This invocation draws on common sense understanding of what are the typical experiences of being a POW in the camp. The ironic utterance, "I went back for the rice" calls for a set of experiences that characterise what life was like in the camp. My concern here with this utterance is not whether this is a true statement or not, but rather how "rice" is used as a culturally emblematic category and achieves discursively a particular social action. While rice and rice eating invoke starvation and malnutrition with mobilisation of the POW identity, it is fairly reasonable to recognise that "rice" has different implications considering that the interviewer is Japanese and does not have the same past experience as those POWs. In terms of cultural convention, rice, for one thing, is a staple food in Japanese diet. In a particular historical context of wartime Japan, it is widely known that rice was a luxury food for many Japanese as it was strictly rationed (e.g. Cook and Cook, 1992). Studies in cultural anthropology (e.g. Ohnuki-Tierney, 1993) inform that rice is associated with more than eating and filling the stomach. Rice is a cultural symbolic system of the Japanese collective self (Ohnuki-Tierney, 1993). For instance, as a religious symbol, rice is sacred and used for many ceremonies and rituals as an offering to the gods. Rice is emblematic of Japanese culture and calls for a wide range of meanings.

So, how do we properly understand the utterance of "I went back for the rice" and the subsequent laughter? The discourse and conversation analytic approach differs from that of cultural anthropology, i.e., it is not necessary to invoke a fixed pre-existing cultural meaning. We need not subscribe to macro-sociological and anthropological views on rice as cultural symbolic system, whether it is religious, gastronomic, health or political economic or ideological. Rather we can look at the ways in which rice as a culturally emblematic category is used by the participants and how the particular meaning of rice is worked up and sets up a relevant context of rice as a conversational topic in the interaction. Looking at the situated use of the word "rice" in a particular context of the interaction, the meaning of a seemingly mundane

expression such as "rice" in the utterance of "I went back for the rice" is locally and interactionally negotiated and defined according to who brings it off in what circumstances.

Importantly the utterance "I went back for the rice" was not accepted as a relevant answer to the question of why the ex-POWs decided to go on a reconciliation trip to Japan. In line 30, Charlie points out the irrelevance of the rice as a reason to go back to Japan based on his observation of contemporary Japan. This observation was made available as a result of his recent participation in the reconciliation trip. Besides Charlie, no one challenged this ironic humour in lines 25-29. Nor did the participants seek clarification or elaborate on it. Is it because of dangerous interactional implications that would possibly lead to stories of starvation and hardships, and even committed atrocities by the Japanese if it was probed any further? We do not know or have to speculate in such detail. What we see signalled and handled is a potential interactional trouble. The role of laughter is more than just a humorous response to the irony. It is managing the sensitivity of the interaction. Put differently, it maintains the interactional order as the subsequent interactional moves sustain the ambiguity of the irony. The ambiguity safeguards an assurance that no one would take an aggressive stance or make an inflammatory comment with respect to past atrocities and other traumatic wartime events that these ex-POWs are highly likely to have witnessed or experienced.

In order to understand this extract, we need to consider the nature of the interview setting itself. This may be called context in our conversation analytic sense, and some analysts would discount it as extra-linguistic information (Durnati and Goodwin, 1992; Goodwin and Duranti, 1992; Potter, 1998; Schegloff, 1984; Schegloff, 1997; Wetherell, 1998). Here the context is not treated merely as background information. It provides important clues to why the irony produced remained ambiguous. The interview setting has a potentially inflammatory consequence, which was brought forward as a foreground. In this case, eating rice is contexualised and the category, "rice" is worked up to invoke a set of experiences and events as rice is being established as relevant in the ongoing interaction. The participants in the interview constantly orient to sensitivity and interactional consequences of what it is to talk about rice eating as the relevance of rice eating unfolds interactionally. The analysis of the extract illustrates that reconciliation is a discursive accomplishment evidenced in the interactional handling of the sensitive

topic by the participants. This affords a claim of the POWs' position of reconciliation. Furthermore, the alternative category of "rice" is drawn and up for grabs in this exchange in which rice is bound to a different identity, namely in this case, the identity of the interviewer, who is Japanese.

Laughter and humour: Discursive management of a sensitive issue of the past

The key interview question asked here is why the ex-POW participants decided to go on the reconciliation trip. The extract 1 is one of the examples of the way in which the ex-POWs and their spouses handled the question. The key question would set up for the participants to perform accountability work, that is to account for reasons for having participated in the reconciliation trip and to state their current position with regard to reconciliation in relation to the war time past. The accounting practice such as this would generate a discursive setting for joint remembering (and forgetting) of the problematic past.

This extract starts with Charlie's carefully given account of how they found out about the memorial built by the Japanese. He makes his point very carefully on a rather delicate issue. His account was uninterrupted until he solicited others to join in. Following Charlie, Sidney comes in with a remark in line 24, " I went back for the rice." This is obviously an ironic statement and no one took it seriously to probe. It lightens up the serious nature of the talk, as if Sidney were guarding against a potential conflict pertaining to the wartime captivity in the Far East. It is a way of policing the interaction, that is to say "let's not get aggressive on the issue."

The interviewer's laughter clearly signals that she was aligned with Sidney's position. It is followed up by Ray coming in with laughter in line 23. Then, Charlie in line 24 comes in with a recitation of the joke. These series of laughter suggest that participants are aligned with Sidney's position (Braun, 1999; Coser, 1959; Glenn, 1989; Glenn, 1991/1992; Hutchby, 1997; Jefferson, 1984; Jefferson, Sacks et al., 1987; Pizzini, 1991).Ted in line 25 recognises the irony and produces a remark of authority by addressing him with a full name. This creates an emotionality in which Sidney is cracking a joke again, hinting a serious nature of the conversation is on the verge. This dead-pan irony is a way of marking out the potential conflict, and the consequence of the irony is part of the work of accountability as well. In other words, the interviewer's straightforward question seeking accounting for the past was responded with the POW participant's reformulation into a non-contentious answer.

The occasioned irony works to be an interactional resource to manage an interaction with potentially aggressive moves on the status of the war-time past.

Positioning and re-positioning with orientation to a potential conflict

Let me focus on the ways in which this account was produced in terms of positioning and re-positioning of the participants. First, this extract illustrates that the account of past action and events is jointly constructed in the interaction. For instance, Charlie gives a first go at it and establishes the occasion with a serious note, and in line 18, he solicits others to follow up his version. Conversation analytic studies of laughter (Jefferson 1984) demonstrate that the role of laughter is more than response to a humorous remark. The utterance has a range of possible uptakes. The various uptakes of the irony display the participants' understanding of the utterance. For instance, in line 22, the interviewer's laughter is an affiliational response to the irony.

Smiling or laughing in response to humour means that "those present underline their acceptance of [the] moment" (Pizzini 1991). Whereas no laugh is a rejection of the humorist, "laughing with others presupposes some degree of common definition of the situation" (Pizzini 1991, p. 478). Laughter establishes solidarity, friendliness, and alignment (Coser, 1959; Glenn, 1989; Glenn, 1991/1992; Jefferson, Sacks et al., 1987). We can consider a myriad of possible ways in which the interviewer could have taken up this remark. Rather than disagreeing, seeking clarification, or even challenging Sidney's irony, the interviewer responded with affiliational laughter, which works to illustrate the interviewer promoting and soliciting more stories and information. In line 26 Ray's comment, "but they don't eat much rice now, do they?" displays his renewed understanding of the rice diet in contemporary Japan. This particular knowledge is presumably available as a result of having participated in the reconciliation trip. Through participants' uptakes of the ironic utterance, rice eating in these exchanges specified a particular context interactionally.

Rice as a marker of cultural change

In this section we will look at a way in which the former POW participants make a point of drastic cultural change in terms of diet. The analysis focuses on the way in which a trouble with rice diet in the camp is signalled by a POW speaker and is jointly formulated in the interaction. The analysis also demonstrates how the speakers

manage the interaction turn by turn by attending to the trajectory of the conversation and maintain it from being offensive to one another.

The following extract presents another instance of the ways in which rice is brought off as a conversational topic and worked up as a camp food. The analysis of this extract focuses on the ways in which the topic of rice is contexualised *in situ* interactionally and the ways in which interactional moves are made by the same participants as they manage sensitivity and orients to a potentially topic. The particular analytic concern is with managing sensitivity in terms of the ways in which a certain problematic topic is mobilised and how participants handle conversational land mines of problematic issues and troubles in opening up and closing down an interactional space.

Prior to the extract, there was an extensive conversation on the various places and port stops that the POWs made before arriving at the camp in Japan. The interviewer sums up the jointly constructed account of their journey from England to the Far East then to Japan, and the ex-POW participants recap and elaborate some aspects of the journey. The extract begins with telling Ray's story of change of diet upon the arrival at a Japanese port.

Etxract 2: Drastic change

```
40    Ray       I heard a Japanese officer say (.) normally
41              normally we never had any bread,
42              °we'd always-° I remember getting on the-
43              ⌈(.) I remember getting on the train in Japan
44    Ted       ⌊Osaka we got to
45    Ray       and I heard a Japanese officer say (.)
46              I will give you three loafs a man and (.)
47              ⌈I was thinking of these (.) =
48    ?         ⌊Ohh:
49    Ray       =you know one English loaf (.) and what we g
50               got then there were three little hard buns
51              like this made of so↑ya I think
52              ⌈hahahahaha
53    Ted       ⌊Aye, but it ⌈was marvellous seeing them.=
54    ?                     ⌊we used to-
55    Ted       =We never chewed anything.
56    Ray       haha hhh
57    Ted       You know (.) we never got issued with
58              a knife and fork because (.) we never had to
59              ⌈cut anything
60    Ray       ⌊hahahaha.
61    Ted       It was just rice heh
62              Ahahahahah
63              ⌈That was a drastic change for us ⌈you see
64    Int.      ⌊humm                            ⌊humm hummm
65  , Ted       From↓ (.) western diet (.) and (.) having
```

```
66              rice three times a day ⌈you know
67    Int.                            ⌊Yeah
68    Ted       A little bits of something sometimes
69              if you're lucky
70    Ray       haahaha
71    Ted       but it caused a lot of (.) stomach
72              up⌈heavals.
73    Int.        ⌊Right.
74    Ted       A lot of lads died in the (.) early days
75              with (.) uh dysentery: and (.) stomach (.)
76              ⌈business, course there=
77    Int.      ⌊umhum
78    Ted       =wasn't the medicine either
79              hummm
80    Ted       ((coughs)) ↑oh dear me (.) but anyway with
81              this Jack said we did all that right around-
82              (.) I think it was uh (.) eleven different
83              Ships I was at, was it?  Seven different
84              Flags flags or something
85    Charlie   Aye (.) and forty two thousand miles
86    Ray       hahahaha
```

Discursively building context

The process of the journey that they account prior to this extract serves not only as a chronological detail of port stops, but also a context of what it is to experience a change of environment, culture, and language all of sudden, as Ted put it "drastic change" in line 63. This is where the issue of food is brought up as relevant as to address the major change of diet "from western diet" to "rice diet." The account given by Ray and Ted (ll. 45-63) provides the vivid instantiation of what it is to be suddenly in an unfamiliar culture of Others. The Japanese officer's declaration that there won't be any bread for them to eat made them aware of the sudden cultural change as Ray notes. The Japanese officer's remarks in the form of Ray's reported speech works as a footing for Ray address that the change was sudden and unexpected, and perhaps imposed as he was told by a figure of authority ("I heard a Japanese officer say..."). The way in which Ray describes the change (in lines 45-52) not only displays the difficulty and lack of readiness to cope with such change, but also works as his complaint about a rice diet. A few interesting contrastive categories are identified - bread vs. rice, buns vs. loafs, which simultaneously invokes a contrast of hard, chewy food vs. soft warm comfort food. The list of the sudden change of diet continues - eating food without proper utensils, food without any textural substance, sudden change of diet from bread to rice ("we never chewed anything, we never got issued with knives and forks because we never had to cut anything"). These are extreme case formulation (Pomerantz, 1986), signalling the speaker's past problem

with a rice diet at the Japanese camp without making a strong and direct assertion. They exemplify the changes he saw in the first instance and made available as a tale of the past and made relevant to be told in the present to profess his difficulty with the change. Followed by Ray's mitigating affiliational laughter (1. 60), the speaker Ted puts forward a claim about the change of diet in line 60 "it was just rice." Again, using an extreme case formulation the word "just rice" legitimises the claim as well as emphasising his difficulty with the change that occurred.

Talk about rice as ethnification process

Furthermore, rice as a category seems to be cast as more than a staple diet food. From the way in which the category "rice" is introduced and its interactional upshot, it addresses the issue of what it is to be in a culture of others - in this case, Japanese culture. It is a way of marking "cultural other" and making a point of what it is to be immersed in another culture without any induction. The account produced in these exchanges pertains to what Day terms as ethnification processes where "ethnic identity as a situated accomplishment of interlocutors" (Day, 1994; Day, 1998).

Considering the contentious nature of the interview, formulation and re-formulation of the change and ethnification of the dietary practice of others have important implications. For example, Ted's add-on comment "Sometimes we got lucky" followed by affiliational laughter seems to attends to the implication—the problematic nature of the interaction and a domain of topics that requires the participants' sensitivity. The laughter is not only affiliational, but also marks the utterance as ironic. The utterance is essentially ambiguous for various reasons. Let us extrapolate the circumstances of the POW camp. The situation in which the POWs' being lucky [with food] is reasonably far less frequent than what is actually said "sometimes". Also, what it is that they are lucky with and how lucky they are, remain unsaid and ambiguous as the subsequent turns were not taken up as the upshot of the ironic statement.

Seemingly, this ambiguous statement is reformulated in a more explicit formulation of another problem, in line 71 in a way of "troubles-telling" (Jefferson; Sacks et al, 1987) as "of course, a lot of stomach upheavals". With the interviewer's quick token of receipt, the particulars of the trouble is accounted further by the original teller in the next turn in lines 74-76 & 1. 78. ("a lot of lads died in early days with dysentery and stomach business."). Ted's turn-by-turn upgrading troubles-telling

invokes death and illness as a routine experience of the POWs in the camp. Rice as a conversational topic shapes an interactional trajectory in which rice not only marks the change of diet, but it is constituted as a category invoking morbid, gloomy and fatal consequences, i.e., starvation, malnutrition, illness and death. However, death and illness featuring the life of the camp fade away in the subsequent turns. Ted's utterance was cut off at the end, the subsequent conversational move signals a change of topic, returning to the prior conversational topic ("anyway Ray said [inaudible], I think it was eleven different ships, seven different flags") in lines 80. This shift is what Bergmann (1990) terms as local sensitivity in topic progression as the participants are developing a conversational trajectory, deflecting from current, on-going conversational topic to the prior one. Here we are not trying to speculate on the intention of the speaker, whether or not the speaker *intends* to go back to the previous topic by moving away from the current topic. The speaker and co-participants of the conversation maintained the conversation in such a way that it was prevented from interactional disrepair, for instance, talking about grim details of the camp and managing a critical point on Japanese rice diet. This shows the interactional management of sensitivity in terms of social accountability. In other words the participants do not explicitly make critical points with the rice diet in talking to the Japanese researcher. In other words, the participants manoeuvre interactional moves in opening up and closing down topics, while attending to the upshot and consequence of what is (and is not) put forward.

Rice as membership category

The preceding extracts are analysed to argue that rice is treated a member's category in which the participants interactionally formulate problems with the past and explicitly establish its relevance in the import. Although not all ex-POW's talk about food is related to rice, the participants construct cultural otherness by using rice as a membership category and ethnify with a particular identity of cultural or ethnic origin. 'Rice', being central to the life at the camp, is brought off not only as a conversational resource as the participants account for what it was like to be in the Japanese camp, but used as a way of addressing unfamiliar cultural practices and claming their difficulty when they were at the camp.

Talk about rice and cultural practices

In this section the discussion focuses on cultural otherness and shows the ways in which cultural otherness is constituted through telling about various objects that they used to use and memorabilia that they brought back to England.

Extract 3: Souvenir

```
100  Ted:      I've got all sorts of souvenirs
101  Int.:     Hummm
102  (.)
103  Ted:      >got a< little or- a little box of that we
104            used to you know
105            We got breakfast out o' a little brown bowl
106            (2.) pap rice
107            [(.) a uh and it was rice (.) crushed=
109  Charlie:  [aye
110  Ted       =((clapping sound))=
111  Int.:     =um huh
112  Ted:      in water (.) and they called it like
113            porridge [you know
114  Int.:              [Yeah
115  Ted:      Just a little brown bowl like that.
116            That's what we got.
117            That was at five o'clock in the morning
118            [was it six o'clock about
119  Charlie:  [ye that was six o'clock
120  Ted:      a six o'clock then you went
120            then you went [(   ) then you got a (.) your
121  Int.:                   [hummm
122  Ted       little box (.) your bento, was it?
124  Int.:     hum, lunch [box
125  Ted:                 [and they used
126            [to put rice in there
127            [((clapping noise))
128  Int.:     [uh huh↑
129  (.)
130  Ted:      and maybe if you're lucky a little bit of uh
131            Soya sauce or something in it
132  Sidney:   aye if you were lucky
133  Mary:     °(hhhhh)°
134  Int.      if [you're lu(h)cky(h)
135  Ray:         [(the first time) the first
136            [time (when )
137  ?:        [lucky
138  Int.:     [(   ) just plain rice
139  Ray:      The first time we got those boxes they had
140            been varnished or something [hadn't they
141  Charlie:                              [(   ) they were
142  Sidney:                               [no they hadn't
143            quite
144  Ray:      You couldn't eat the rice
145  (.)
146  Charlie:  [o↑hh
147  Int.:     [(   )
```

Stories produced on these items give rise to personal and collective shared meaning of the past at a given time and circumstances in interaction. These tangible objects have

physical materiality to represent a particular past at issue, as they aid recall of past events. They also work as a discursive resource to enter into the particular moment of the past, and thereby become a topic and made at issue in interaction. The extract is subdivided into four parts due to a lengthy sequence. Also in the analysis of the extract, I elaborate on the discussion of the management of sensitivity in talk. Particular to this extract is that the sensitivity management is achieved through co-participation of the speakers (and the recipients) as they talked about "rice" as a common reference point and establish mutual understanding of what it was like to live with a rice diet and cultural practices of rice eating, that are markedly different and unfamiliar to their own. Here, I look closely at the participants', both the ex-POWs and interviewer's, turns and uptakes as they formulate problems and difficulty with eating rice at the camp. They draw differences and similarities of eating habits and food. In so doing they constitute cultural otherness when they refer to a specific difference in food and eating practice at issue. The analytic focus is on the ways in which the topic of rice is brought off and discussed. It also looks at the ways in which the speakers and recipients invoke relevant knowledge of rice, for instance, various ways for cooking and eating are brought off interactionally to display their cultural knowledge of rice due to the experience of captivity and then establish (and not establish) a common understanding of the past - life of the prison camp in Japan.

Let us look at the ways in which the "little box to put a rice ball" (line 103) was nominated as an example of "souvenirs" from the labour camp. The talk about the box resources the conversation as the speakers provided detailed routine activity related to rice diet in the camp and accounts why the box was a significant item for the POWs to bring back from Japan. For instance, the ex-POW participants go on to say more about what they used to do with that box and explain the kind of routine activities such as cooking, serving and eating rice in the camp. The box is not just a container for food. It explains how the food was prepared and provided to the POWs in the camp and why eating rice became of major importance in their life at the camp. The participants' talk on "the little box" exemplifies a socially organised form of remembering a particular eating practice in the past.

Ray's problem of dietary change, specifically the difficulty of eating rice, is discursively formulated through the description of the box, a rice container provided in the camp. The participants extensively describe the use of the box, along with demonstration and gestures, as to how a specific kind of rice (l. 106) called "pap rice"

was cooked and served in a particular way for a particular occasion. It contributes to a formulation of his problem with rice diet and claiming his difficulty in coping with such change. For instance, the nature of his difficulty is formulated in the description of the container invoking smallness and peculiarity as a container of food in its box-shaped appearance varnished wooden material, and the unusual way of preparing the rice (">got a< little or- a little box of that we used to you know we got breakfast out o' a little brown ball"; "pap rice (.) a uh and it was rice (.) crushed. in water (.) and they called it like porridge you know"; The first time we got those boxes they had been varnished or something hadn't they"). Smallness of the box and the kind of food being made out of pap rice seem to implicitly be making a critical claim about scant portions and non-substantive quality of food ("porridge") in the camp. The tastelessness of food is marked by a comment made on adding the sauce ("a little bit of uh the Soya sauce") in an ironic formulation in line 130 ("maybe if you are lucky"). The speaker's laughter (in line 134) signals his humorous and ironic take on the comment. The uptake of the ironic comment follows with the interviewer's recitation of the comment with laughter within her speech. Here in lines 132 & 133 Sidney's uptake is followed by Mary's laughter and the interviewer's recitation with laughter (l. 134) display their alignment with the irony. The uptake of the irony interactionally accomplishes a shared understanding of what it is to eat rice in the given condition, without having to comment on the obviously unpleasant rice diet and eating practices in the camp. Considering in particular that Mary, Ted's wife, and the interviewer have no experience of the camp, they seem to draw their own understanding of what it is to be in the POW camp to make sense of the ironic remark. What is at issue here is not whether the understanding of the irony is resourced in the same experience of the participants in the interaction. The participants draw on their own knowledge of the POW camp and its living environment, which seem to sustain the ongoing interaction. Particularly important to note is the interviewer's vicarious re-formulation of Ray's problem in line no 138 "(   ) just plain rice." The formulation of Ray's difficulty with eating rice (l. 144) is an joint discursive accomplishment.

The interviewer's contribution to the conversation up to this point is relatively small. Her brief turns signals that she is following a conversation, minimising her own opinions and encouraging more responses and information from the POW participants. Her way of talking seems to exemplify a moderated version of the institutional talk, in which the interviewer solicits answers and information from the

interviewees. With that role, she remains non-intrusive and encourages the participants' talk on the little box and rice. Let us look at how her identity as Japanese is marked and made relevant in talk. In line 122, Ted actively seeks the interviewer's response by checking his memory of a Japanese term for the lunch box that is at issue. First, he gears the question directly to the interviewer in line (l. 120, "then you got (.) your little box (.)") with the use of pronouns, "you" and "your," and a brief pause at the end for his pursuit of the interviewer's response. Then, the turn in line 122 specifically asks the interviewer for her to reply to his question ("your bento, was it?"). The use of pronoun "your" makes this question directly relevant for the interviewer, and therefore interactionally nominates the interviewer to take the next turn. Also the English equivalent of bento, lunch box, which the interviewer offers ethnify her as Japanese, someone who is a culturally informed expert on the topic in progress.

Rice as membership categorization device

However, the interaction management of sensitivity is not a one-time only occurrence and does not determine a fixed course of conversational trajectory. It has to be maintained and worked by the participants as they orient to cultural sensitivity and whatever the topic that on-going interaction makes at issue in situ. The ensuing extract is an example that how the participants work in making a point on rice eating as problematic, yet avoid and fend off potential conflicts between the interviewer and the ex-POW participants, or even among the ex-POWs themselves due to different positions that they may take. In the extract, the participants hold an extended discussion on rice and offer their stories and explanations, while dipsplaying their knowledge and experience with rice. Those various features and characteristics that emerge are attributed to a particular ethnicity or culture of other. The descriptions of the features and characteristics can be looked at as a source of potential conflict among the participants. The participants draw on discursive resources of talk about rice with various classification terms for rice. These categories appear in contrast. Let us see how these various classification of rice in contrast resource the interaction.

Extract 4: Just plain rice

```
200  Ray:      Cos anyway, all our cooks didn't know how to
201            cook rice did they↓
202  Charlie:  Well↓ er:: they're quite-
203  Ted:      no::: [(unless)]
204  Charlie:         [ they're] quite- canny
205  Ray:      Some of the rice was er:
206  (.)
207  Charlie:  not as good as the Japanese rice (.) the
208            rice (.) Japanese is flaky (a bit) innit
209            [you know
210  Int.:     [um   ummm
211  Charlie:  But we got inferior rice as the prisoners
212            of war
213  Int.:     Oh ye[ah?
214  Ted:           [ oh:::h
215  Charlie   We didn't get the best rice.
216  Int:      Hu[mmm↓
217  Ray:        [well the first rice you got it had been
218            Treated with lime
219            hadn't [it?  Really for sowing
220  Charlie:         [it ha:d aye
221  Ted:      °We had°lime rice (.) I think it
222            [was used for plantin' the rice.
223  Int.:     [what's that?
224  Int.:     Oh↓
225  Ted:      a lime rice and what was that the other one?
226            (.) °lime and something else°
227  Ray:      The lime (was to:) with the preserve it er::
228            [as: a: seed rice you see?
229  Ted       [(it was another kind) and it was a
230                  [horrible
231  Int.             [It's a brown rice?
232  Ray:      Pardon?
233  Int.:     Brown rice?  It's like uh (.)
234  Ray:      Oh yeah [(   )
235  Charlie:          [with the rusk on you mean
236  Int.:     [Not- not refined rice
237  Charlie:  [ah we used to get that sometimes
238  Ted:      We used to fight for rice polishers (.)
239            didn't we
240  Charlie:  [aye
241  Sidney:   [rice polisher(h)
242  Ted:      You know when you polish the rice- the-
```

This extract provides an example that demonstrates the point in which participants are constantly attending to what is presently at issue and how that can be brought off and sustain its relevance. The extract is rich with a collection of categories regarding rice. After Ted's episode of fiasco on his attempt to improve the taste of rice, Ray has another go at claiming the problem with rice. Ray's critical comment in lines 200-201 "all our cooks didn't know to cook rice did they?" offers an explanation in which he was not the only person to experience the problem; even an expert had difficulty with rice. The speaker is normalising the problem—implying that rice itself was the

problem and warding off other possible explanation of why the rice served taste terrible. This invokes the notion that rice is foreign to them, and not part of English culture. However, in Charlie's circumspect response to Ray, the problem of poor quality and taste of food is attributed to the differential treatment by the Japanese "we got inferior rice as the prisoners of war" in line 211 and "we didn't get the best rice" in line 215. The contrast between inferior rice vs. best rice and the way in which the contrast is predicated to the subject, we, implicitly implicate the Japanese for differential (and possibly racist) treatment.

The ex-POW participants offer a set of categories of rice as a way of classifying themselves in opposition to the Japanese. The categories work as membership categorization device (Sacks 1992b (1995)). For instance, "the inferior rice" and "not... the best rice" are brought off as rice served to the POWs. This makes an opposing category available, that is what Charlie nominates in line 209 as rice that the non-POWs, i.e., the Japanese eat, ("the Japanese [rice] is flaky"). The ex-POW participants jointly works up the category of rice and offer more examples: "lime rice" that has "preservatives" has sub-category such as rice for eating vs. rice for sowing/planting (ll. 219-228, "Really for sowing.. I think it was used for plantin' the rice" The lime (was to:) with the preserve it er:: as: a: seed rice you see?"). These ascriptions are made relevant by participants' turn-taking. Without making the opposite category of lime rice, the speakers' position, we make the opposite position available, and thereby implicate the Japanese to the problem of rice. The category of rice worked up by not only the ex-POW participants. The interviewer joins in the conversation, while confirming and displaying her knowledge of rice ("It's a brown rice?" "Not- not refined rice"). Ted's claim about horrible taste of rice was overlapped by her turn, and his point was not picked up by others in the subsequent turn.

Membership categorization device

As these extracts show, a close examination of talk about rice and a rice diet allows us to see what Sacks calls a "membership categorization device" (1974) and "category-bound activities" at work (1992b/1995). Many activities are commonsensically associated with certain membership categories. So if we know what someone's identity is, we can work out the kinds of activities in which they might engage. Similarly by identifying a person's activity, for instance, 'crying' , we provide for what

their social identity is likely to be (in this case, a 'baby')[1]. Sacks (1992b) refers to activities which imply identities as "category-bound activities (CBAs)" (p. 249). It is defined as follows: "many activities are taken by Members to be done by some particular or several particular categories of Members where the categories are categories from membership categorisation devices" (Sacks, 1992b/1995, p. 249). Rice invoked in the exchanges of this extract affords a collection of categories: plain rice, pap rice, brown rice, wet rice and soup, wild lime rice, polished rice, not refined rice, etc.). These categories are derivative of rice and they are nominated and deployed by the participants. What is more, the participants' working up these categories makes the opposite of these categories simultaneously available. Varying degrees of participants' understanding and knowledge of rice are put forward in different forms and treatment depending on the quality and nutrition.

Chapter summary

In this chapter, I have analysed discourse examples concerning the topic of rice and argued that sensitivity management is central to social accountability in talk. I have argued that humour, jokes and irony are an interactional resource with which participants make a claim about the past experiences (e.g., captivity by the Japanese) as they orient to their positions and identities that are put to use in the interview talk. The analysis looked at ways in which jokes, humorous and ironic comments were produced, and the subsequent moves uptake with which the recipients made in response. The produced humour and ironies themselves are ambiguous because they hinge on multiple meanings (literal and non literal), with which the speakers and recipients jointly work on to display their stances and understanding to the claims made through the irony and humour. The present analysis reveals that laughter is one of the salient features of the talk in managing sensitivity of the problematic topics and difficulty put forward by the participants. Laughter is not only recipients' positive response to the produced humour and irony, but also signals recipients' alignment to the position of the speaker. Chosen examples show the very exchanges in situ in which laughter functions as mitigation and signals a non-aggressive stance as a moderating action. It sustains an interactional opening without getting into disrepair while suspending and marking off a potentially problematic issue.

---

[1] This refers to his classic example of "The baby cried. The mommy picked it up."

All the extracts analysed in this chapter concern the conversational topic of rice. Rice was treated as a key conversational topic in interview with the ex-POWs in discussing their position as reconciliation. Talk about rice and activities related with rice is central to the life of the POWs and emblematic of culture of the camp. The talk also creates a reference point, or context in which the participants discursively managing the sensitive domain of topics without having to be hostile to one another. I argue that the discursive accomplishment - interactional handling and management of such sensitivity affords for them to claim their positions on reconciliation,

Studies of culture and cross-cultural communication have traditionally concentrated on classifying and interpreting features of a particular culture, which are put forward by the researcher through his or her theorising cultural phenomena and applying standardised measurement techniques and conceptual framework. In contrast, the discursive approach commits one to explicating the locally produced and situated meaning in the making—illustrating the ways in which members handled cultural issues and establish their significance interactionally. What is demonstrated in this analysis is how a seemingly mundane topic such as rice becomes a reference point with which the participants do the business of making claims about the past—accounting for their difficulty with a particular cultural practice in the past. The discursive approach employed for this analysis provides a viable tool as it permits us to see the very moment-by-moment process in talk where people's cultural understanding and knowledge are displayed, shared and established as relevant. Reference points such as rice are discursive resources to achieve social actions of accountability of the past in social practices of reconciliation and other socially organised sense-making activities. The discursive approach illustrates the ways in which cross-cultural issues are handled and made relevant in people's conversations. This analysis demonstrates that participants' personal and shared sense of cultural resources in the talk about their past experiences and the current position of reconciliation. The discourse analysis is a powerful and viable tool as it points out the very moment in the talk where people's understanding of culture is displayed. Personal and shared sense of culture is not merely a background nor contextual information, but the very resource that people use and work on in talk.

The next chapter examines management of sensitivity in terms of the participant's work of accountability for the past. As this chapter's extracts were chosen by a common theme of rice to study the situated use of rice as a culturally emblematic

category, the extracts in the next chapter pertain to the ex-POW participants' use of Japanese words and phrases. The aim is to examine the discursive accomplishment of sensitivity management as they account for the past experiences in the camp and demonstrated their problem with communicating in Japanese by using the Japanese words and phrases.

CHAPTER 5

Accounting for the past: Sensitivity and the language of the past

Introduction

In the previous chapter, rice is a counter-point where people's culture and ethnicity were at issue in their talk about life at the POW camp, as they remembering together what it was like to live in captivity by the Japanese and live with a rice diet. This chapter, while carrying over the cultural issues of ethnification and construction of otherness, explores accountability of the past actions and events in looking at the participant's use of the language of the past. In the previous chapter the term rice was the analytical common thread. The chapter focuses on the ex-POWs' ubiquitous use of Japanese words and phrases in the interview talk. The analysis shows the ways in which Japanese words and phrases are mobilised and made relevant to the present interactional setting to perform a particular social action - accounting for what it is to live in a Japanese camp in captivity during the war. Performing such social actions requires for the interlocutors to be sensitive to one another as the particular past is highly consequential and problematic to the present interaction. It is reasonable to think that the mobilised past made relevant in the present interaction displays the participants' discomfort, animosity and aggressiveness from the conversation about the POW camp in the interview. But for those interview participants who went on the reconciliation trip and claimed their reconciliation status by participating in this research interview, it would be highly problematic and disturbing if they could not curtail their display of hostility toward the interviewer through telling atrocity stories to her. How do they manage such problematic discursive occasions with the Japanese interviewer? They orient to potential troubles, and their accounts and stories of the past were produced in such a way that they would not provoke any hard feelings and hostility to one another. I call such discursive work "discursive management of sensitivity talk." This is one of central themes in this thesis, and it leads to the overall

argument that people do reconciliation in talk and that the discursive accomplishment of reconciliation is a way of claiming their position of reconciliation.

Several questions are posited to guide the analysis : how does the past become relevant in the present interactional setting? How is a problematic past brought off (or not brought off) as part of sensitivity management? How is the speakers' difficulty with a person, event or situation addressed and handled both by the POW participants and their spouses as well as by the interviewer? How are their positions and identities established as relevant as a resource for the ongoing interaction? These questions are attended to in the analysis of the extract, which would provide an empirical basis for the discursive approach to studies of reconciliation. Before doing so, I outline briefly a conceptual background and basis for the notion of the language of the past as a central argument in which time as a non linear concept is considered in this chapter.

Language of the past: A discursive approach to time

The use of the Japanese words and phrases is identified as a pervasive feature of the interviews with the ex-POWs. The present analysis focuses on the interactional use of Japanese words and phrase which carry the wartime past into the conversation in the present. For example, the Japanese words and phrases such as *kyootuskeeh* (the English equivalent of "stand to attention"), *sagyoo takusan* ("a lot of work/labour"), and *ichi-ni-san-shi* ("one two three four", counting numbers as in roll calling) seem to reflect their wartime experiences in Japanese camps.[1] Such phrases clearly come from the interviewees' experiences of war-time captivity and working in camps under the Japanese command. In the present analysis, these words and phrases are not treated as evidence of their linguistic competence or skills; nor do they suggest a long-term retention of the acquired language and propose that a cognitive model of a long-term memory is at work as a consequence of, presumably, a deliberate form of language learning. These Japanese words and phrases are, instead, viewed as historical shards, a kind of rhetorical marker and parcel of the past, which are put to use to invoke a particular version of events and experiences. In this view, time is not a linear concept and the distinction between past and present (and future) does not mark

---

[1] Note that although they lived and worked in Japan for about 1 and half years, their knowledge and command of Japanese language are very limited; their production of utterances is at one or two word level. The discussion in this chapter does not assume their acquisition and retention level of the Japanese language in terms of command of grammar (i.e., syntax, semantics and phonetics).

chronological ordering. Language of the past, therefore, is not confined to the past, nor does it put us back and forth in time as it were a time trip. Rather, it works as a signpost, which points to a set of relevant references (e.g., time, place and/or event) in telling what, when and how the event had happened and why it is significant to the present interactional setting and how consequential it is to the future lives of the people involved. I will explore this issue of time in the discussion section, drawing on linguistic work on deixis.[2] Thus, accountability of the past is accomplished via interlocutors' use of language of the past in interview talk.

Accounting for the past in the interview on reconciliation

First, I look at a discursive formulation of the interview occasion, the ways in which the interlocutors (i.e., both the interviewees and interviewer) formulate the interview occasion interactionally as they attend to sensitive issues involving the past events and actions. The analysis of Extract 1 aims to look at three core themes that were identified as follows: (1) emergent ordering (2) display of sensitivity in starting the interview, and (3) language of the past: invoking the problematic past. Then Extract 2 is used examine uptakes and interactional consequences to the mobilisation of the problematic past. The analysis, informed by the analytic concepts of alignment and affiliation, looks at various ways in which the participants display their sensitivity to potential troubles and their understanding of what is at issue in the ongoing interaction. Their talk attends to material objects and features of their immediate physical environment. I aim to demonstrate an interdependency between talk and the physical environment as interlocutors attend to material objects and some features of their immediate physical environment. This interdependent relationship between the speaker's sensitivity to the ongoing talk and the physical environment will be looked at in terms of discursive vs. non-discursive ordering (Brown, Middleton et al., 2001).

Data background and participants

The chosen extract is taken from the one of the group interviews with four ex-POWs and two of their spouses. These sequences come from an initial part of the recorded tapes before the interview officially began. As part of the pre-interview activity that was organised by the host of the house where the interview took place, lunch was

---

[2] Pierce (1894) and other work refer to deixtic function of languag, for instance, Holt (1996) exmanines it in direct reported speech and Billig (1995) in political discourse of patriotism.

served, and a toast was made by all those who were present to mark this gathering. Buffet food and various alcoholic and non-alcoholic drinks were served. The extract is taken from the very moment when all finished or wrapping up eating and drinking. The extracts show the ways in which the participants formulate the significance of the interview occasion and organise its activities accordingly. The actual interview did not start until this socialising segment was over. Moreover, the interview visit involves more than just a visit asking questions and getting answers, especially it centres on a sensitive topic such as their war time experiences and post-war experiences of reconciliation. The question as to how the interviewer, virtually a stranger to the interviewees, is accepted in the home of a participant then becomes more than ethnographic details of the interview process—how the interviewer obtained the access to a particular site of the fieldwork, and what sort of efforts the interviewer made in building a rapport with the participants. Silverman (1993) discusses the interview as a form of communicative action in which the interviewer's identity becomes a participant's concern and becomes a topic of conversation.

In taking these ethnographic details into account, I consider the following questions: what do these socialising activities of drinking and eating together contribute to creating participants' anticipation and expectation for the interview? How do they get down to business of interview talk of reconciliation following the pre-interview activity? The pre-interview socialising activity can be regarded as part of the work being done for and as reconciliation. Rather than identifying each unit of activity and speculating on intention and motives or inner states of the participants as to what caused them to act in a particular way, the analysis of turn-by-turn organisation of the talk will unravel the ways in which the participants mobilise their discursive and non-discursive resources to formulate expectations and significance of the interview as the interaction progresses.

Discursive formulation of the interview occasion

The first extract starts as the participants are wrapping up drinking and eating the buffet lunch provided by the host participant, and are in the process of putting away used plates and glasses and cups, and getting ready for the interview. The extracts will unveil the ways in which the participants get themselves ready for the interview under which potential difficulties lie. Particularly it will show the ways in which the participants orient to the notion of being interviewed and do identity work with the

interviewer as they are interactionally made aware of and reach a consensus of who is taking charge and to establish the significance of the interview occasion.

Extract 1-1: "Stand to attention"

```
 1  Ted:      I haven't worked all morning getting it right
 2            For you just to look at it
 3  Audrey:   Well- well I usually eat first and then
 4            [I (        )
 5  Ted:      [(right) right. (Now) what would you like to
 6            Hear about (.)would you like to hear how
 7  Int.:     Yes, uhm (.) are you finished with all-
 8  Ted:      Aye we're all right (.) [we're all right
 9  Mary:                             [yes yes
10  Ted:                                  [I am all right.
11            You are in charge now.
12  Int.:     Oh, no. hohoho.
13  Ted:      You give the orders. Kyo:tuske:h³.
14  Int.:     Hh no, no, no, no. I'm not here for that.
15            Hehh. Um ((drink))
16  Ted:      (Now hurry up when) Charlie's out and then
17            You might get some (.) order.
18            Heh he[h
19  Mary:           [heh heh heh
20  Int.:     Well (.) is this a comfortable (.) seating
21            [arrangement for everyone?
22  Ted:      [get yourself comfortable
23  Ray:      Oh we're lovely and comfortable.
24  Charlie:  Are you finished with this plate, honey?
25  Int.:     Yeah. Thank you.
25  Charlie:  Okay, now.
27  Int.:     I'll get my notebook then.
```

Emergent ordering and sensitivity

This extract illustrates a discursively emerging process of ordering, where two parties, the veterans and their spouses and the interviewer, are establishing the initial order of the interaction pertaining to the imminent interview. They display their positioning according to their expectations and perceived objectives of the interview. The process is emerging as discursive accomplishment because the issues of initiative-taking, authority and chairmanship of the interview are both implicitly and explicitly made relevant, the interlocutors approach those issues with jocularity, humour and hints of irony. They use these rhetorical devices to manage the interaction sensitive to where problematic natures of the past might emerge. The upshot of such discursive work is to set up and maintain social and moral order of the interview as a group activity. The very question of who is in charge of the interview seems to be the participants' concern in this segment of the extract. The interviewees establish a participatory

framework in regard to the organisation of social relations and physical space in participating in a social event such as the interview with a researcher whom the participants meet for the first time.

In the opening sequence Ted as a host of the gathering, displays his concern that everyone eats and drinks plentifully as he urges others to finish the food left on the plates (ll. 1-2). Research on sociology of food informs us that food and talk, albeit being a seemingly mundane everyday practice, are closely linked one another in terms of formation of subjectivity, self and identity formation and experience of embodiment as they involve several social, cultural and moral issues that are relevant here (Lupton, 1996). (Cultural issue of food and eating has been extensively examined in the previous chapter.) For example, buffet food was served specially to mark this occasion of the research visit and interview on the topic of reconciliation experiences when the speaker-host Ted flags the expectation that the food served here is to be eaten by all.

Moreover, this remark (ll. 1-2) signals the end of the pre-interview activity of eating and drinking and marks a transition to the beginning of the interview. Ted calls for a change of topic marked with an attention seeker in line 5 "(right) right Now." His subsequent question addressed to the researcher, "What would you like to hear about (.) do you like to hear how" (ll. 5-6) explicitly registers that it is time to get down to a business of the interview activity. The interviewer is equally sensitive and polite as she displays her concerns for other participants and seeks their consensus in line 7 ("Yes, uhm (.) are you finished with all-"). This is part of the work of doing being a good interviewer, that is, being sensitive to the participants' needs and making sure that everyone is happy and agrees with the proposed transition. Spousal participation in the interaction is marked by Mary's overlapped response to her husband (l. 9), confirming Ted's call for proceeding with the interview.

More importantly, the exchanges made between Ted and the interviewer seem to attend to a difficulty and to the sensitive nature of how to take charge of the floor. For example, while Ted declares the transition of authority from him to the interviewer in lines 10-11, the interviewer expresses her concern to be a non-intrusive and pay a special regard to the participants in line 20 ("Is this a comfortable seating arrangement"). She presents herself as someone who is collaborative and non-intrusive in taking over the conversational floor, yet to take on a difficult task of

---

[3] English equivalent of this Japanese phrase is "Stand to attention!"

conducting interview on war-time captivity and post-war reconciliation experiences for the next few hours. Her interactional moves, therefore, are crucial to the success of the interview because the presentation of the interviewer, as non-intrusive and collaborative, achieves amicable and agreeable communication in the interview. The display of her sensitivity to the participants' spatial comfort conveys that the interviewer is taking up the initiative of the interview.

However, the difficulty of starting the interview is handled rather autocratically. Let us look at line 11 onward ("You are in charge now"). The interviewer's disagreement (l. 12, "oh, no. hohoho.") to Ted's explicit pronouncement of the change of command (l. 11) hearably signals her reluctance and trouble dealing with the issue of being "in-charge. Ted continues somewhat playfully, as if he were teasing her, and assures that she is in charge (in line 13, "You give the orders"). Immediately after this, Ted commandingly utters a Japanese phrase, "*kyootsukeeh*," the Japanese equivalent of "stand to attention!" (l. 13). The Japanese phrase is responded to with the interviewer's surprise and resistance to the assigned authority (in line 14 "hh no, no, no no, no. I am not here for that. Heh"). Here an emergent ordering of the interview occasion is noted, it is extremely problematic.

The language of the past: Invoking the problematic past

What is it that she is having trouble with here? Let us now focus on the interviewer's trouble and how that is handled interactionally. In the extract, Ted marks her as someone, who now has command of the group, "You give the orders. *Kyootsukee.*" (in line 13). Note the way in which the speaker Ted utters the Japanese term "*Kyootsukee*", English equivalent of "stand to attention". It not only draws the participants' attention so that the interview can get started, but also invokes a particular version of the past, in which this expression was presumably used and spoken to the POWs by the Japanese guards. The interviewer's utterance in lines 14-15 ("hh no, no, no, no. I am not here for that. Hehh, um.") manages potential trouble invoked by the Japanese phrase. Her trouble with the phrase is signalled gingerly with slight laughter first, and then with the use of the deixis "that." Although "that" does not spell out exactly what it refers to, it is hearable that a link with a troubling past is invoked precisely in the way the interviewer responded. In other words, her difficulty pertains to that with aligning with the participants' framing of the occasion invoked by this Japanese word. Her resistance is not to the meaning of the word itself, but to the

ways in which the interviewer is framed as such - someone who 'gives orders' and is 'in charge.' Considering the participants were former POWs, it is reasonably inferred that the word *kyootsuke* is a language of Japanese guards. The word is pointing to a problematic past, which invokes an asymmetrical power (and autocratic and oppressive) relation between British prisoners and Japanese guards in the Japanese camp during the war. This power relation of the past is juxtaposed to the current relation between the interviewer and the speaker. What is termed as asymmetry of knowledge and equalities (Drew, 1991; Linell and Luckmann, 1991). The interviewer's trouble is a reaction to the way that the interviewer is positioned as if she were those guards, and this positioning is made possible by the use of the language of the past *kyootsukee* and the uptake of the interviewer. Furthermore, this asymmetrical relation can be looked at in terms of ethnification. The language of the past *kyootsukee* ethnifies the interviewer as someone who understands Japanese as an addressee of this Japanese phrase with a demarcation between who gives orders and who receives orders. The interviewer's position grants a position of the guard in the past, but this is taken to a problematic concern. The whole issue of getting started with the interview precisely hinges on what is at stake in having a conversation on such topics.

Ted's rhetorical move on the one hand draws an attention from the rest of the participants, but on the other hand, without having to describe exactly what it is, it makes a particular version of the past relevant and invokes a specific way in which such military salutation was done in the camp during the war. This is an ironic subversive replay of the past because it is Ted, participant and ex-POW who is doing the call, not the interviewer. Ted goes on to make another reference to 'order' (ll. 16-17 "Charlie's out and then you might get some (.) order. Heh heh"). Ted's jocular treatment of the occasion is hearable in his laughter (in line 18) and followed by Mary's affiliated laughter in overlapping Ted (l. 19). The laughter here safeguards the potentially problematic conflict and reassures that there is no offensive implication to the previous remark "you might get some orders."

As Linell and Luckmann (1991) argue, asymmetries identified in these exchanges are fundamentally a dialogical issue of power and authority - right at the centre of what reconciliation is dialogically - managing asymmetries - not presumed but attended to. In line 20, as the interviewer marks a change of topic ("well" and a pause), the asymmetrical relation between the interviewer and the participants is

attended to in the way in which the interviewer begins to take charge of the floor. The interviewer displays her sensitivity to the participants in the question (ll. 20-21) attending to their comfort "is this a comfortable (.) seating arrangement for everyone?"). Overlapping the interviewer, Ted reciprocates his sensitivity to their comfort as a mutually relevant concern. The other participant, Charlie, makes an interesting move by addressing her with a term of endearment, "Are you finished with this place, honey?" in line 24. Here, the interviewer is not positioned as someone in charge to give orders. Charlie's use of "honey?" in line 24 is displayed as reworking of the interviewer's position as distinct from authority invoked by the language of the past. It is instead positioned in terms of discursively marked affection. This term of address interactionally reorganises the positioning of the interviewer, she is someone who is not to be regarded as an authority figure. This reorganisation is done in a context of re-arranging the physical environment as part of contingent activities (in line 24 & 27), Charlie puts away plates and cups; the interviewer gets a notebook).

Alignment and misalignment via ethnification

In this section, I will analyse the next extract by looking at how discursive features of alignment and ethnification are accomplished in interdependencies of discursive and non-discursive ordering - ethnifying technical and human agency. Both human beings and objects are ethnified in ways that require sensitive management of the interaction. I will argue that positioning of technical and human agency with local sensitivity to materials and physical environment shapes the relevance of the current interaction in remembering of the past. Similarly, the formulated significance of the current interaction is oriented to and projected into future significance of remembering the past.

Discursive vs. non-discursive: talk and the physical environment

So far, I have focused on analysing interactional organisation of sensitivity management in formulating the significance of the social ordering of the occasion. In this section, I would like to look at another way of managing sensitivity in terms of what Bergmann identifies as "local sensitivity" (1990). For example, the extract reveals the participants' concerns over perceived implication and ramification of taking part in the interview. Conventionally in qualitative research the researcher often deals with this issue in terms of research ethics—having an informed consent

and keeping anonymity and confidentiality in handling the recorded interview material. In this extract, the participants themselves make an issue of their being tape recorded as they talk about the interviewer's tape recorder that was switched on and left on the table. While the issue of their interview talk is being recorded had been agreed and made an official consent, the ex-POW veterans attend to the future implication of the interview in the way they noted the tape recorder being switched on while the interviewer was getting ready for the interview. What I would like to bring to light is the interdependency of discursive and non-discursive ordering accomplished via ethnification of technical and human agency. In other words, both human and material objects are ethnified in ways that requires sensitive management of the interaction.

To extend the people's orientation to physical objects and the environment, it is helpful to refer to a notion that there is interdependency between discursive and non-discursive resources in examining talk. In a study of people's use of e-mail as a means of organising their remembering of events (Brown, Middleton and Lightfoot, 2001), it is argued that there is a tension or interdependency between discursive and non-discursive resources in the way in which people mobilise. The interviewer is out of the room at this point. Let us look at the extract 1-2 to see how such tension is played out.

Extract 1-2: Japanese wizardry

```
28  Ted:       She's gonna start recording (I think).
29  Charlie:   Any more plates, anywhere. ((some noises))
30             No right carry on then (.) any more tea in
31             there (.) aye there is (.) I'll have another
32             Cup
33  (.)
34  Ted:       Are you gonna get the electronic recording,
35             (these (.) well) electronic wizards these
36             Japanese. Oh (.) do you know that bit where I
37             talk about when we went into the- (.) we put
38             wor hands under [the tap (.)
39  Ray:                       [mm yeah
40  ((clap))
41  Sidney:    Yeah
42  Ted:       stops and starts
43  Sidney:    Yeah
44  Ted:       hhh well I was at Fennicks about a couple of
45             year ago °I dounno whether it might have been°
46             on the toy floor and the restaurant I went in
47             and- [when I came out=
48  Mary:           [(         ) around there
49  Ted        =when I came out there was a bloke trying to
```

```
50               wash his hands you know (.) he was gannin'
51               "where's the (.) tap" "oh" I says, "allow me
52               to show you" (.) put your hands under shhh ·
53               take them away (.) I says
54  Mary?:       (put- put them in)
55  Ted:         I says I learnt that in a Japanese bus
56               two years ago
57  Ray:         Well uh I tell where they've got them uhmmm
58               (.) you know when we went to Norway
59  Ted:         aye
60  Ray:         we got them in (where you got on the bo↑at)
61  Ted:         Did they (.) [aye
62  ?:                        [aye
63  Charlie:     they've got them (        Norway)
64  Ray:         Aye
65  Ted:         Aye they got them in Fennicks, aye (.)
66               on the-
67  Ray:         Well the best thing I ever (had) was a
68               (.) a heated- (.) a toilet seat ·
69  (.)          ((Int. comes back to the room))
70  Ray:         °Koy- [Koy-° Koyki you haven't got one of
71               Mind
72  ?:                 [hahaha
73  Charlie:     I have in my car
74  Ray:         Heated toilet seat
75  Int.:        A heated toilet seat [in Japan
76  Charlie:                          [a heated seat=
77  Ted:         =Shesheeeh. Right, order plea::se. (      )
78  Ray:         Yes
79  ?:           Just (    )
80  Ray:         Yes. I was wondering what the light was for
81  Ted:         Order please for the lady
82  Int.:        Oh thank you ((for someone giving her seat))
83  Ted:         From the Orient
84  Mary:        Are you doing any degree on that?
85  Int.:        Yes.
86  Ted:         Yes, she'll get a degree. If you give the
87               Right answer, she'll got a degree.
88  Int.:        No, no heh, no.
89  Ted:         And when she's a big professor she'll invite
90               You (down/there)
91  Int.:        No heh
92  Ray:         °to Tokyo°
```

The opening sequence (ll. 28-33) provides an example in which the participants constantly attend to objects and physical changes of the environment and deploy awareness of those as conversation topics. Physical changes of the environment and the interactional setting, in this case, the interviewer's temporary disappearance from the room and the sight of the tape recording device in operation, raise the participants' awareness of consequences of 'being on tape'. How does such awareness affect subsequent turn-taking moves and overall development of conversation?

In response to the awareness of being on tape with the tape recorder in sight,

Ted works up the notion of Japanese electronic wizardry (l. 34) by telling a story of his experience to the rest of the participants that he was able to tell to a stranger how to use an automated water tap (ll. 34-62). The narratives of Japanese wizardry invokes a flagship feature of contemporary Japan -- Japanese innovative-ness and their manufacturing and technical competence in post-war era. As following up and glossing on his story, Ted seems to give a tribute to and claim a benefit of having been to Japan recently (line 55, "I says I learnt that in a Japanese bus station two years ago"), attributing his knowledge to a trip to Japan (i.e., knowing and being able to show to a stranger how to use a sensor-operated water tap in the public restroom). Ray's subsequent story as a second story (Sacks, 1992a; Sacks, 1992c) shows his alignment with Ted by highlighting the relevance of Ted's story and displays Ray's understanding of the first story.

So why are these stories significant to them? What do they do interactionally? The notion of Japanese wizardry is constituted as a direct reaction to the awareness of the physical environment. The talk attends to the presence of the tape recorder and marked as an occasion to talk about their experiences. In the telling of the stories, the speakers put forward a current position with respect to the past experiences. In other words, at this particular moment of the interview we can see how the past experiences are re-organised and re-configured according to the current position toward Japanese people and Japanese products. The ways of telling of such objects are contingent upon the nature of the occasion and attend to the future consequences of having told those personal experiences. Here this particular example illustrates that non-discursive/objects resources the collective remembering in which the past is remembered in terms of the present circumstances (Brown, Middleton et al., 2001). In this particular setting of remembrance, the objects such as the tape recorder are ethnified interactionally. The participants' narratives of lived experiences on those objects establish a relevant link with the ethnic position of the interviewer.

Here is another example in which the ex-POW participants attend to the change of the environment that occurs in line 67. Ray offers his narrative as a second story on Japanese wizardry. In lines 68, Ray's attention to the interviewer's return to the room is hearable in his incomplete speech and interpolated pauses. Following another pause (l. 69), he then recruits the returning interviewer into the ongoing conversation of the topic (l. 70). Charlie's uptake in line 73, "I have [heated car seat] in my car" in one hand shows his alignment to the ongoing conversation by offering

his experience with a heated seat. At the same time it can be heard as his attempt to provide a context of the conversation or to provide an answer on her behalf because the way in which the interviewer is recruited into the ongoing conversation is abrupt. The interviewer's recitation of the topic in question and ponderous brief reply indicate her misalignment—her difficulty in answering Ray's question (line 75). Charlie's overlapped answer (l. 76) as well as Ted's call for attention in English this time (l. 77) take the interviewer off the hook to answer Ray's question on the spot. They display their sensitivity to the interviewer's difficulty with Ray's question and re-joining in the conversation.

There is hearably an ambivalence in the exchanges and the ways the uptake were produced (and not produced) with respect to the interviewer's launching the interview. The misalignment displayed by the interviewer at her return to the room is immediately obscured by Ted's call for order in drawing the participants' attention (l. 72). With Ted's call for order, two sets of ascriptions to the interviewer were made: one is a gender-based marker "the lady" produced by Ted "order please for the lady" (l. 81), and the other is an orientalist cultural label "from the Orient" (ll. 83). The interviewer does not take up those references directly in her formal polite acknowledgement of Ted's introduction in line 81. The interviewer's non-uptake (or silence) seems to signal her problem with this ethnification marker.

The absence of the interviewer's turn regarding "from the Orient" is immediately pre-empted by Mary's question providing a new but potentially problematic topic with respect to the issue of future consequences of the interview ("Are you doing any degree on that?") in line 84. Note the way Ted handles Mary's question. Taking up the interviewer's literal answer (l. 85), Ted builds on the interviewer's answer (l. 85, "Yes, she'll get a degree") and then reformulates the answer ("If you give the right answer, she'll get a degree"). The interviewer overtly resists Ted's reformulation with interpolated laughter (l. 88). Her reply is recipient-designed as it were designed to be heard that she is not offended by Ted's reformulation. A similar response is made regarding Ted's other answer (ll. 89-90, "And when she's a big professor she'll invite you (down/there)"). This is followed by Ray's add-on ethnification marker of "to Tokyo" (in line 92).

Extract 1-2 provides plenty of examples of how the participants and the interviewer exploit their understanding of culturalness of an individual, what it is to be Japanese, a researcher, and research participant, and so forth in talk in the process

of initiating the interview. Several times the interviewer displays discomfort and difficulty in taking up a particular ethnification marker made by the participants and replies with a minimum response or negation with laughter to mitigate potential tension and conflict. The interviewer's overt resistance and laughter (1. 88) potentially invoke a particular overstated ascription rendered by the ex-POW speakers with respect to the spelled-out future consequence of the research, that is, the interviewer will be rewarded with a degree. Similarly, in line 91, the interviewer's reluctance to be committed to the version of the future described the participant (to become a professor, to invite the participants to Tokyo, etc.). The conversation is filled with potential interactional breakdowns. Such awareness or sensitivity to potential troubles in which the conversation can go wrong at any point is evident in the ways in which the participants produced their stories of past experience with Japan and the ways in which the ethnification of the interviewer is accomplished using various discursive means of stories and personal anecdotes on the objects in their immediate environment, ambiguous and ironic statements, laughter and alignments. These means have been identified in the ways of alignment and repair of misalignment are achieved turn-by-turn with display of sensitivity to the uptakes.

As I illustrated in the analysis of these extracts I looked at turn-by-turn organisation of talk, in which the interviewees and the interviewer are sensitive to and continuously attend to what is being said by who and how it is being said. Furthermore, the participants also take notice of and incorporate elements of what's in their surroundings (i.e., various objects such as a tape recorder, cups, plates, dishes and people's non-verbal and actions) in their discursive domain. Such discursive references to those physical objects and environmental features are deployed as conversational resource to establish social relations, order and rules of an unfolding activity of the interview. The deployment of discursive resources identified in this section are integral part of what it is to talk about their experiences of reconciliation activities—managing sensitivity where participants' alignment and misalignment are displayed and re-adjusted and repaired according to the relevance and goals of the discursive activity. Managing sensitivity therefore is a core analytical principle of discursive action of reconciliation and social remembering where the interlocutors' alignment and misalignment are made relevant to be attended to in a stream of talk. In the next section, I will focus on how management of sensitivity to a problematic past is attended to in the interview, in which the participants were asked to account for

their reasons for having participated in the reconciliation trip.

Accounting for the past: The problem of the language

Let us now move on to the analysis of the accounts being produced in the interview itself in regard to key events and experiences of their war-time captivity in Southeast Asia and Japan. I will look at the ways in which participants produce their accounts for reasons for having taken the reconciliation trip to Japan in 1992. The extracts chosen here are from the same interview with Extracts 1-1 and 1-2. In this particular sequence, the participants were asked to state their reasons for their participation in the reconciliation trip.

The analysis of Extracts 2-1, 2-2, and 2-3 are guided by the same analytical issues as in Extracts 1-1 & 1-2, the ways in which the participants account for the past and handle potential troubles interactionally as they attend to sensitive issues involving the past war-time events and actions. Using these different extracts from the interview, however, I will explore and highlight various other discursive practices of accountability, in particular with the ways in which moment-by-moment formulation and reformulation of the significance of the past is made relevant in the present interaction. The analytic themes with the use of the language of the past include (1) alignment and misalignment via ethnification, (2) demonstrating the past: the language of the past invoking then-ness, (3) mutual ethnification and double accountability.

The two extracts presented in this section illustrate a sharp contrast to the interaction prompted by the language of the past. This analysis will show the interactional moment as to what happens when the conversation suddenly reveals that participants do not share the same perspective and conversational reference point. Both the interviewer and the interviewees question each other's epistemic positions and accordingly re-position themselves and the other. Consequently, the positions are re-aligned in the uptake of the Japanese term. The uptake, the talk about the term provides a jointly constituted account for why those British POWs were there in the camp in the first place. The present interview talk provides for the discursive space in which the participants profess and account for the problem of the language and communication with Japanese guards at the camp.

Background of the extracts

The extracts are taken from the beginning part of the interview, a few minutes after the initial interview question was given—why they participated in the reconciliation trip. In answering this question, Sidney, one of the ex-POWs gives an account of how he and his fellow veterans in the north-east of England found out about the news that local residents in the village near the Japanese copper mine had refurbished the grave of the 16 dead British POWs and erected a memorial. Sidney was the first contact who happened to read a newspaper article written by a Catholic priest who saw the grave and learned that the Japanese villagers have been maintaining the memorial for all these years since the POWs left at the end of the war. Here the extract starts with the interviewer probing on the article that Sidney happened to have read in late 1980's regarding a discovery of the grave and the newly erected memorial.

Alignment and misalignment via ethnification

This section focuses on the analytic concept of alignment and misalignment. I will illustrate that the language of the past is a way of marking ethnicity and/or cultural-ness of other as part of ethnification process. The following extracts demonstrates how the interviewer's mis-alignment is problematised by the use of the language of the past and how such mis-alignment marks the interviewer's ethnic position and invokes the significance of her linguistic competence.

Extract 2-1: A lot of work

```
200  Int.:     Hum (.) What was that article about? You said
201            That you weren't quite impressed.
202  Sidney:   Well it was concern(ing) this (.) party of
203            (.) eh Japanese POWs (.) who had left who
204            Had been working on the railway in
205            Thailand(.)
206  Int.:     Hum
207  Sidney:   And they were (.) chosen to go to Japan to
208            Work in the copper mines.
209  Int.:     Hum
210  Sidney:   Uh at least working in the mines, they didn't
211            Stipulate what mines. Could have been coal
212            Or anything. But anyway
213  Int.:     Hum
```

This part (ll. 200-213) exemplifies a serious account giving of the past events as to how the ex-POW participants ended up in Japan. The undisrupted account, except the interviewer briefly signalling her receipt of the information, indicates the hearers' attentiveness to the account. Sidney's carefully produced account constitutes a neutral,

fact-oriented perhaps well-rehearsed narrative of the their journey to Japan. His terse and cryptic description of the journey concerning the exact place names and dates suggests a past linking with the wartime captivity and labour in the camp.

In contrast to the Extract 2-1, the next extract marks a discernible change in interaction prompted by the use of the Japanese phrase in line 217, while Sidney is still accounting for the journey when the three hundred POWs were transported from Thailand to work in copper mines in central Japan.

Extract 2-2: "*Sagyoo takusan*"

```
        214  Sidney:   We finished up we were in the copper mines.
        215            And uh (.) that would be:: (.) in about (.)
        216            Beginning of July (.) when you started work
    →   217            (.) sagyoo takusan
    →   218  Int.:     I'm sorry?
        219  Sidney:   Sagyoo takusan.
        220  Int.:     Sagyoo takusan,
        221  Sidney:   Humm
        222  Int.:     You mean- Japa-, this is Japanese word
        223  Sidney:   Ha:h?
        224  Int.:     What's, what, what
        225  Mary:     That's what he was saying.
        226            It is a Japanese (.) wor:k.
        227  Int.:     Hum
```

Let us look at line 217 onwards where the interviewer expresses some kind of a problem regarding the Japanese expression uttered by Sidney. The ensuing interaction comprises the interviewer's uptake of Sidney's Japanese phrase and the upshot of the interactional moves made by the participants. This phrase marks the interviewer as someone who would comprehend it considering that it is produced as an integral part of Sidney's account for how they ended up in a Japanese labour camp. It is evident that the interviewer's problem does not derive from the interviewer's lack of linguistic comprehension and competence, but more to do with the way in which Sidney used a Japanese phrase in the middle of his account. To illustrate this point, let us look at the uptake to examine how this problem of language is handled. The analytic concept of alignment-misalignment will help point out discursive features of sensitivity management and handling of the language problem.

The interviewer signals her problem with the phrase first time in line 218 (I'm sorry?) and then in line 220 by repeating the phrase. With Sidney's brief reply (l. 221), the interviewer's recognition that the phrase has a Japanese origin is made more explicit in line 222 ("you mean-, Japa-, this is Japanese word"). This also conveys a surprise element as it were that is something that she did not expect to hear. This

works to ethnify her as Japanese, marking her as someone with linguistic competence to identify the phrase as Japanese. Sidney's brief response to the interviewer implies self-evidency of his answer as if there is no need to explain what the phrase means (l. 223 "ha:h?"). The interviewer enthusiastically seeks an explanation in line 224 ("what's, what, what). Then, Mary, Ted's partner, (who has never been to Japan), on Sidney's behalf, offers her gloss on the term, treating the interviewer's problem as a linguistic token problem in line 225 ("That's what he was saying. It is a Japanese (.) work"). This also ethnifies the interviewer with someone with Japanese ethnicity. The interviewer's terse acknowledgement (l. 226 "hum") is registered as no-news receipt. This uptake shows that the interviewer's misalignment is made to be a relevant conversation topic, being problematised and attended to as a language problem. What counts as the interviewer's work of sensitivity management is noted in the way that she does not deliberately account for the nature of the interviewer's problem with the Japanese phrase. On the other hand, the participants treat her problem as a comprehension problem. How is this apparent misalignment worked up and handled in subsequent turns?

Extract 2-3

```
228   Sidney:   Sagyoo (.) work, [you know?      [Takusan
229   Int.:                      [Yeah↑ (.) Taku[san means
230             many.
231   Ray:      Sagyoo takusan↑ [heh heh heh
232   Sidney:                   [Sagyoo takusan.
233   Int.:     Yeah?
234   Ted:      Shig↑o:to, shigo:to.   Sagyoo
235   (1.0)
236   Ted:      [(You can't really understand)
237   Int.:     [Work, yes.
238   Ted:      Wakarimasuka?
239   Int.:     Hai, [wa(h)ka(h)rimasu hh ((Eng.:Yes, I
240                              Understand)) ((laughing voice))
241   Ted:           [Shigoto
242   Sidney:   [°She doesn't speak Japanese?° ((talking
243             to Mary))
245   Mary:     [°She don't (know)°
246   Ted:      [oh no Shigotoo sagy-h. Japane:se he:dai:
247             des.⁴ ((talking to Int.)) SAGYOO, SAGYOO
248             ((commandingly in a deep voice))
249   Int.:     Humm
250   Ted:      Takusan sagyoo ((deeper voice)), you know
251   Int.:     Ahhh, [hai  (Eng.: ohh, yes)
252   Ted:            [But [u:h=
253   Ray:                 [hahhhhhah.
```

---
⁴ English equivalent is "[Here/it is a] Japanese soldier."

```
254  Ted:       =Shigoto is more polite I think. °Shigoto,
256             Shigoto° work, work, [sagyoo
257  Int.:                          [u:mmm, u:mm, ye:s
```

In line 228, Sidney translates word *sagyoo* into its English equivalent. The interviewer quickly cuts in and complete Sidney's half finished utterance and assures that the she has no problem of translation by translating herself the second word, *takusan* into English (l. 229, "yeah↑ (.) *Taku[san* means many"). Ray joins in with his recitation of the phrase followed by laughter, signalling his alignment indicating his familiarity with the phrase as a shared knowledge of the participants (l. 231). Ray's recitation of the phrase and moderating laughter seem to orient to mitigate the interactional tension in dealing with interviewer's problem with the phrase. So, what is it that the interviewer is having a problem with, if not the meaning of the phrase? Although her understanding of the phrase is undoubtedly confirmed in the exchanges (ll. 226-228), she does not appear to be let go with the problem when she elicits further explanation in her reply "yeah?" in line 231. Ted resoundingly repeats its synonym (*shigoto*) and the original phrase (*sagyoo*) (l. 234) in pursuit for the interviewer's signal of understanding. The silence in line 235 conveys self-evidency, implying the interviewer's no-news receipt. Ted's question in English (l. 236 "you can't really understand") overlaps the interviewer's delayed response in her display of her linguistic competence (l. 237). Then, in line 238, this time in completely Japanese, Ted checks the interviewer's understanding of the Japanese phrase ("*Wakarimasu ka?* Japanese equivalent of "Do you understand [it]?"). Again, the interviewer replies in complete Japanese with interpolated laughter in a laughing voice. The laughter and laughing voice signal a problem of her stating the obvious. These exchanges in mixed languages, both Japanese and English (ll. 228-240) orient to her linguistic competence in question and even a suspicion of authenticity of her ethnic identity.

On one hand these exchanges exemplify that the participants test their suspicion of the interviewer's linguistic competence. On the other hand, they achieve the participants' alignment with the interviewer by speaking to her in Japanese and translating the Japanese words for her. Language switch or what is typically known as code-switching (Holmes, 1992; Myers-Scotton, 1997) from one language to the other (in this case English to Japanese) achieves closer social relations and solidarity by way of speaking the language of the other. In so doing, the participants display their sensitivity to the interviewer who is experiencing a language difficulty.

Code switching has two interactional upshots. First, it ethnifies the other addressee, in this case, the interviewer. For example, Ted displays his alignment to the interviewer by speaking to her in Japanese without mixing any English (l. 238). This act ethnifies the interviewer - labelling her as Japanese - by adopting a conversational modality to speak to her (using her native tongue) the addressee, the interviewer, and thereby providing with a mutual frame of reference. Second, it is managing the interaction that can be potentially problematic, by way of displaying sensitivity to the troubled interviewer with Japanese language. Interestingly a side conversation between Sidney and Mary (ll. 242-244) provides another example of them being sensitive to the interviewer's language problem when they make an issue of her linguistic competence. In line 242, hearably in a softer voce (and instead asking directly to the interviewer), Sidney expresses his concern to Mary with the interviewer's competence in Japanese. The side conversation displays his normative expectation of the interviewer linguistic competence. This point of normative expectation ties in well with the notion of dialogic asymmetries about interlocutors' knowledge (Drew, 1991; Linell and Luckmann, 1991).

Up to this point (to line 244), the interviewer has not exhibited any sign of understanding or acceptance of the offered explanations. Ted gives a gloss on "*sagyoo takusan*," with an embodied action (Goodwin, 2000) - acting out a Japanese soldier and mimicking a Japanese soldier's commanding speech in Japanese in line 245 ("[oh no *shigotoo sagy-h. Japane:se he:dai: des*. ((talking to the int.)) <u>*SAGYOO*</u>, *SAGYOO* ((commandingly in a deeper voice))"). This contexualises the phrase *sagyoo takusan*, offering a richer representation and context by invoking a range of association to wartime experiences. The interviewer's immediate response to this embodied action of doing Japanese soldier is not enthusiastic (l. 248, "hum"). Ted repeats the soldier's voice (l. 250, "*Takudan sagyoo* ((deeper voice)), you know"), and the interviewer this time marks her receipt of the explanation "*ahhh, hai* (Eng.: ohh, yes)" in Japanese. Ted then offers his gloss on the Japanese word *shigoto* as a more polite word. Ted is making himself accountable for the language problem that the interviewer had by explaining a difference on a nuance between *sagyoo* and *shigoto*. Here he is displaying a sensitivity to the interviewer with the pragmatics of these words, suggesting that the word *sagyoo* is a word in the context of the prison camp, and is not suited to the present interactional occasion, whereas *shigoto* is a more polite word. This explanation is precisely Ted's work of accountability, accounting for why she

had a problem with the Japanese phrase in the first place (in lines 157 & 159), "*Shigoto* is more polite I think. °*Shigoto, shigoto*° work, work [*sagyoo*"). Ray's overlapping laughter with Ted adds to the sensitivity accomplished in Ted's account for the reasons for the interviewer's linguistic difficulty.

Double accountability and mutual ethnification

The above analyses have highlighted discursive features of how ethnification and alignment are achieved as interactional management of sensitivity in talk of reconciliation. The participants' position of reconciliation is put forward by way of managing interactional moves and displaying sensitivities to others in handling the language problem. An implicit assumption is made about the interviewer's Japanese ethnicity and cultural knowledge with respect to what she knows and how she knows it. In particular, what has been made visible in the analysis is that the interviewer's competence in Japanese language as her native tongue became questionable with Sidney's use of *sagyoo takusan,* and as a result the interviewer's interactional trouble with the term is handled interactionally as part of reconciliation talk. What is displayed in these extracts are Sidney's normative expectation and orientation to the presumed interviewer's ethnicity and cultural identity. I am not making an overt claim about the speaker Sidney's intention, whether he intended to test the interviewer's linguistic competence and authenticity of being Japanese as if he sets up this scenario to test her. It is the way in which the very use of the term made the participants' concern with the interviewer's ethnicity relevant and allows addressing them as a relevant concern interactionally. So, ethnification, the very process of ethnifying someone in talk is analysable as a discursive accomplishment. It signals an interactional trouble and is attended to in line 216-223. The interviewer's misalignment with the rest of the interlocutors is problematised and held accountable.

There is another dimension to this misalignment, the interactional trouble and its interactional consequence of handling it. The interviewer's display of the language problem works in turn as a way of marking the ex-POWs' identity, as those who are familiar with this phrase, either by actually having been in the camp (ex-POWs) or by being exposed to the language through the ex-POW spouse (e.g., Mary). Therefore, the underlying narrative and account of the past are simultaneously available as ex-POW's accountability of the wartime past. In other words, two levels of accountability work are operating here: the interviewer's accountability as authentic Japanese with

linguistic competence at a native speaker's level, as well as accountability issue for the ex-POWs.

The analysis of the uptake of the interviewer's trouble raises the issue of authenticity of the ex-POWs' Japanese, that is, whether they are convincingly speaking Japanese words for the interviewer. The interviewer's trouble constitutes their accountability of their experience of having been in a labour camp in wartime Japan. The interviewer's problem with the language, therefore, is the ex-POWs' problem at the same time. This explains why the uptake of the interviewer's misalignment consists of more exchanges in Japanese as the POWs are prompted to produce more vocabulary to attend to their concern with their Japanese language. In this sense, use of the language of the past ethnifies the interviewer as someone who is presumed to understand Japanese, and in turn ethnifies the ex-POWs as people who once was in a cultural setting in which Japanese was spoken.

Asymmetries of knowledge

As observed in the analysis, the interviewer and the interviewee operate on presumed shared understanding of the interviewer's knowledge - her cultural-ness, ethnicity, and linguistic competence, etc.—which is made relevant and topicalised in the earlier examples taken from the interaction before the interview starts. Intricate discursive moves are evidenced as a discursively formulated understanding of the interview setting and the interviewer—the ways in which the interviewees set up expectations and agenda of the interview and various ways to ethnify the interview. Let us focus on crudely this notion of shared-ness in terms of asymmetries of knowledge. It can be argued then that the interviewer's misalignment identified in this analysis is due to what is termed dialogic asymmetries of knowledge (including the ability to understand and speak language in this case) between the interviewer and the interviewees (Drew, 1991; Linell and Luckmann, 1991). Asymmetries (or inequalities of knowledge) occur often in various institutional settings, which involve communication between two parties of different knowledge (e.g., lay and expert interactions in doctor and patient in medical consultations, caller and service staff on telephone help-line, etc.). Studies of communication in these settings often provide the ways in which "asymmetries of knowledge may generate difficulties of various sorts, including misunderstandings and breakdowns in mutual comprehension between professional and client" (Drew, 1991, p. 23). Following from this,

asymmetries of linguistic knowledge are made visible by the misalignment (or misunderstanding) occasioned in the present interaction between the interviewer and the interviewee, first by Sidney and then those participants who share this language of the past. Moreover, this language of the past, *sagyoo takusan* is situated in the past, linked to the past experiences in the camp in Japan, which the interviewer has no way of getting access to. In this sense, asymmetries identified in this analysis are historically (and biographically) induced and constituted in the present interaction in which the present and the past are conflated. In the next section, I explore further this notion of conflated time of the past and the present regarding the language of the past.

Folding the past into present: Time as non-linear

Sagyoo takusan, the Japanese equivalent of 'a lot of work' or 'labour' by default does not make a direct association, nor does it imply the wartime treatment in a Japanese camp. It is the occasioned use of the term that allows the link between the term and the kind of experience that is referred to without spelling out what that experience is. Along with the previous accounts (given by Sidney) of the journey to Japan as a foreground contexualises this Japanese term "*sagyoo takusan*." It thereby creates a plausible context for the interlocutors to identify a link between a set of presumably occurred events and activities as well as personally and collectively shared emotions associated with the circumstances of work and environment of the camp upon their arrival. The phrase works like a metonym, invoking a then-ness, a particular situation or scenario of the past in which a set of experiences, events, and circumstances of the past were evoked, without explicitly giving prosaic details. It achieves an economy of expression, where the speaker's subjective past immediately becomes available to the recipients. Alternatively this can be viewed as a footing shift from the speaker narration to the storied events themselves ("when you started work (.) *sagyoo takusan*"). The rhetorical contrast generated here accounts for a sudden change of environment that the ex-POW participants (claim to have) experienced in line 125. The sudden-ness includes the very problem of having to understand Japanese phrases such "*sagyoo takusan*" uttered by the camp guards presumably without receiving formal language instruction and induction to a new environment.

"*Sagyoo takusan*" as a metonym attributes a range of experiences associating with the sudden change of their environment where they were put to work at the camp. Also, it marks out a possible scenario of the life in the camp because that word,

"*sagyoo takusan*" discursively mobilises a version of the past and invokes some attributes that are potentially problematic. The troubling past is constituted without having to describe the detail of what it is to do a lot of work in the labour camp in wartime Japan. Looking at the collocation of the Japanese phrase, it is used as part of the speaker's vocabulary without distinguishing it from the rest of the utterance in English in a carefully produced narrative of the journey ("we finished up we were in the copper mines. And uh (.) that would be:: (.) in about (.) beginning of July (.) when you started work (.) *sagyoo takusan*"). Sociolinguistic concepts such as code-switching may be useful to account for how speakers establish closeness of social relation to a degree. But it is does not sufficiently address intricate positionings evidenced in the uptakes and the here-and-now development and organisation of speakers' turns as they are attended to potential interactional troubles and breakdowns and managed to accomplish discursive reconciliation.

Here I would like to emphasise that the discursive approach would preclude a conventional sociolinguistic approach to analysing a foreign language phrase such as "*sagyoo takusan*" by looking beyond what's available in the text. The analyst herself can mobilise her cultural knowledge beyond the text, various resources of contextual, extra-linguistic information and makes them relevant in the analytic process. I am not making any inferences as to whether this was taught to them by, for example, Japanese guards in the camp or the like. What I demonstrated in this part of the discussion is that the use of the Japanese words makes a range of associated experiences and activities in the available in the present interaction. And this is done without having to speculate on how it became part of their vocabulary and what was the exact circumstances in which such expressions were used. I argue that ambiguity produced here prompted by the use of the language of the past evidences the interlocutors' management of sensitivity to potential interactional troubles. This discursive management of sensitivity qualifies the notion of discursive accomplishment of reconciliation, that is reconciliation is a moment-by-moment accomplishment in which potential interactional troubles are jointly managed by the interlocutors in the remembrance of the war-time past.

Does this term then intrinsically invoke unpleasant (or even gruesome) details of the life in the camp? How do we know what experience and event this term signifies, and how does such a link become possible? In order to answer these questions, we will now examine the situated use of the language and how the

interlocutors render contextualisation of the language of the past in the uptake of the term.

It links to a particular version of the past that becomes possible as shown in the previous analysis, time can be viewed as a non-linear concept because the distinction between past and present (and future) is not based on chronological ordering of events in sequence. Language of the past, therefore, is not confined to the past, nor does it put us back and forth in time as it were a time trip. Rather, using Pierce's notion that the language (words and phrases) refer to time and place (Pierce, 1894), it may be argued that the language of the past works as a signpost, which points to a set of relevant references (e.g., time, place, or event) in telling what, when and how the event had happened and why it is significant to the present interactional setting or it is consequential to the future lives of the people involved. Thus, accountability of the past is accomplished via interlocutors' use of language of the past in this interview talk.

The analysis of the extracts (particularly the extracts 2-1, 2-2) provided an empirical basis for an argument that language in use subverts time as linear. The participants' experiences in the past are folded in on current social actions in a way that completely disrupts the linearity of the lived experience. This seems to undermine a conventional use of common places such as "put the past behind"

This must surely be a discursive view of reconciliation. There 'the past is not put behind you.' The language of the past folds the linearity of lived experience. The handling of this folding which interactionally shows as a misalignment is what the talk orients to. In so doing, the language and experience of the past is settled in to the project of its present. We see a discursive settlement of the past and present in the ways in which misalignments are managed interactionally.

Chapter summary

The analysis of the present chapter allowed me to pursue the issue of language of the past from a point of view that the language of the past mobilises a particular version of the past available to accomplish accountability of the past actions, events and experiences. Speakers' use of the language of the past created the interviewer's difficulty with the language, as it invokes the potentially troubling nature of the past. A discursive view of reconciliation argues that it is precisely the ways in which the interactional management of sensitive issues of the past is accomplished that affords

the participants a position of reconciliation. Identified in the analysis are various discursive features of talk in which interlocutors handle misalignment and asymmetries of knowledge (i.e., the interviewer's difficulty with the language of the past), while attending to how the interactional present others would hear and interpret the potentially troubling accounts that were mobilised by the language of the past. The language of the past is not a way of accounting for the past, but becomes an interactional resource in which the interlocutors of differing positions would display their sensitivity to the interactional other to manage a potentially hostile and aggressive interactional occasion.

In the next chapter, I examine the use of redemption narratives that were produced at the interviews and pursue the issue of accountability with a particular focus on how the POW participants' account for change. I revisit the language of the past as one of the main discursive devices with which ex-POW speakers gain access to a particular past in the telling of the redemption narrative. The mobilised war-time past made available via the language of the past and other discursive means is positioned in parallel to the recent event, invoking a change of speaker's position with respect to reconciliation. Other discursive devices include footing (Goffman, 1981) and multiple positions (Bamberg, 1997; Davies and Harré, 1990; Harré and Van Langenhove, 1991; Van Langenhove and Harré, 1993), prosody and deixis (Holt, 1996) to examine the ways in which the speaker's change is addressed and establishes its significance in accordance with the circumstances of both in the storied past and in the present interactional setting. The speakers re-configure the significance of the past and accomplish moral accountability in the telling of the redemption narrative. I argue that establishing a moral accountability is what it is to be reconciled with the troubling past.

CHAPTER 6

Accounting for change: Moral accountability and interdependency of public and private relevance in talk of redemption

Introduction

This chapter presents an analysis concerning discursive practices of moral accountability occasioned in remembering of the former POWs' participation in the reconciliation trip and other related events of WWII. The chapter's overall aim is to examine ways in which narratives about 'the past', as produced in an interview setting, constitute particular identities and membership in social relations. In claiming the participants' identities, the participants account for change, address moral sensibility of the past and reconfigure the significance of the past from their present position. To this aim, I examine two extracts from the interviews with ex-prisoners of war as 'experience narrative' (Schrager, 1983). I look at how such talk can accomplish 'situated identities' as the speakers took different footings in two different points of the past. I shall also look at the interactional uptakes of the produced narratives, as to how talk generated interactional opportunities for the participants to interpret together the narratives, address publicly and privately relevant issues of the remembered past and re-configure their significance in relation to their present lives. I am interested in looking at how these narratives contribute to a reconstitution of understanding in common about the cultural and moral order of the remembered past and historical era in which the reported events took place. The analysis also aims to demonstrate how participation in the reconciliation trip affords a context for the redemption and moral work in which the past was reconfigured. The analysis of this chapter is to address a larger question concerning what it is to remember events and experiences of W.W.II and what people do with memories of the war and post-war life experiences in the context of discursive reconciliation.

Analytic Orientation

According to the discursive perspective, the accounts are not treated as definite facts about people's lives and past events, but they are occasioned in such a way that address the current concerns of the participants who are engaged in the interview. In addition they can be seen to handle alternative versions of their experiences of life. The interview was focused not on war per se, but rather on what the participants do with that event and experience of having participated in the reconciliation trip. The issue here is not whether they have reconciled with the wartime past, nor what has been reconciled as an outcome of the reconciliation trip. Rather, the interview talk was looked at in terms of the following questions: (1) what do the participants say about their current position in relation to the wartime experience?; (2) what has been constituted as the impact of the war experience on their post-war life?; (3) what kind of identity work do they do in their telling of the narratives?; (4) how do they establish a particular version of past as relevant to demonstrate their current position?

Data Source

Background to the interview: The participants and the interview setting

The extract is taken from a group interview with four interviewees; two of ex-POWs who took part in the reconciliation trip, a spouse, the Japanese informant who accompanied the group of the reconciliation trip as an interpreter. The interview was conducted at a participant's home in Greater London in spring 1998. It lasted nearly four hours including afternoon tea served by the wife of the host halfway through the interview. The interviewer is the researcher herself. The ex-POWs and the wife were in their late 70's. As in the other interviews, the interview in a formal sense did not begin immediately after my arrival to the site. The Japanese informant's participation in this interview enabled a reunion of the members of the reconciliation trip. The first half an hour of the interview talk was dedicated to some catching up with one another among the interviewees. Following from it, the interviewer officially announced the beginning of the interview stating the purpose of the visit and addressing the key question of why they decided to participate in the reconciliation trip. This question was designed to address the central theme of my thesis, reconciliation as well as analytic issues of identity, accountability of the problematic past, construction of facts, blaming, apology and forgiveness.

Accounting for change

The aim of the analysis is to introduce the main issue of this chapter: ways in which the participants account for change by telling redemption narratives and displaying a reconciliatory position. The redemption narratives reveal the way in which the participants make sense of the war-time past, while the significance of the past experience was reconfigured according to the present position they hold without having to say they have been reconciled. Sense making is part of the interview talk when they profess change, taking a different footing, and mobilising the private and publicly relevant past into talk.

The following extract is a story told by Freddie, an ex-POW participant in the group interview. As a context to keep in mind, this particular story was told after the speaker shared with the rest of the participants an episode of a little reunion with his old mates at Heathrow airport on the day of their departure for Japan on the reconciliation trip. He said that this reunion put him on the road to reconciliation" after having experienced the old camaraderie at the airport.

Extract 1: Photograph story

```
1    Freddie    I was in Battersea Par:k some years ago,
2               after the war, ten years after the war (1.)
3               and I'm sitting out in the open (air) a cup
4               of tea at the table and two little (0.8)
5               children running around in front of me (2.)
6               and I (said) to myself, "oh my god, >is
7               that< Japanese↓." Because they could be
8               Chinese or (0.8) [Thai, if at any=
9    Int.                       [°hum°      °hum°
10   Freddie    = >you know what I mean<, but to me they
11              were Japanese. (1.0)  I thought (0.8)
12              I didn't have to wo-wonder very long because
13              it's just behind me (there's) somebody
14              calling out "Oi, koi." (1.8) right?
15   (.)
16   Freddie    come here or
17   Int.       [°hum°
18   Freddie    [yeah, I thought (.) I know that↓. (.)
19              That means come here, or means come back.
20              I half reluctantly turned around and the
21              next table behind me was a Japanese man and
22              (   woman    ). (.) They all got up and
23              they went down, stood by the lake. (.)
24              And this is the story. He:h took (.) a
25              picture (.)of his wife and two children
26              (s          and) two children. She:h
27              came (.) and took a picture of him and the
28              two children. (.)  And me being (.) I don't
29              use the camera and all that, >(I      now)<
30              oh↑ but I would, but I would nor↑mally do in
31              a case like that, °and I have done it (.)
```

```
32              any times° (.) I would go out and say and
33              "Excuse me >do you mind if<, would you like
34              me to take a photograph of all of you?"
35   Int.       Yes.
36   Freddie    I-I half got up and I thought (.)
37              "°No why should I↓°" (.) And I regretted
38              that. I didn't. °I regretted it.°
39              But some years later, when I was over at
40              Haruko's place in Croydon, a Japanese (.)
41              man, lady, doctor↑?
42   Maki       Hiro?
43   Freddie    they stood (.).hh on the (     ) stairs
44              by Keiko's room there and I took a
45              photograph with my camera then.  I thought
46              (.) perhaps I've been redeemed at last.
47              -ha hh  You know.h [That's a little thing.
48                                [hh
49   Int.       Yes.
```

This story appears quite ordinary at first glance. So, let us see how discourse analysis unpacks this. Ostensibly, there is a symmetry of action, in which we see the speaker's photo-taking experiences in two different occasions—before and after the reconciliation trip. This story invokes a notion of change, perhaps in the attitude to, perspective or perception of the Japanese. It is the way in which the speaker, Freddie's attitude toward Japanese people has changed due to the participation in the trip. What this trip afforded him is the opportunity for him to see the world differently. The story marks the speaker's change of attitude toward the Japanese and a new perspective that Freddie now possesses. The story captures a moment when Freddie came to realise that for all these years the past experience of the war-time captivity had prohibited him from being a person that he thinks he normally is, in this case, an agreeable person who would stand up and offer to take a picture for someone in a public place.

Claiming vs. showing the speaker's position

Considering that this narrative was produced in response to the question involving the speaker's position and its change due to the activity of participating in the reconciliation trip, I take the view in which the narrative serves not only to claim the speaker's position on reconciliation, but also to show how the reconciliatory position was adopted in the telling of the narrative. The speaker's narrative elaborates on his previous claim that the little reunion put him on the road to reconciliation. It shows what reconciliation means to him and the significance of the story is made available to the recipients who were hearing it in this interview. The actual telling and sharing of the narrative with the interview participants make them experience the change and

how that change of position appeared in respect to reconciliation. The narrative account of the photo-taking events, which the speaker claims caused him to change his attitude to the Japanese people. Then, how come this story works a stronger claim of reconciliation rather than simply claiming that "I have reconciled"? Let's do some more unpacking. I argue that it has to do with the identity work that the speaker is doing discursively. This is embedded in the talk and actual telling of the narrative.

Descriptions as scene setting

The story begins with detailed description of where and when the unveiling story took place. The first few lines (ll. 2-5) are so called "scene-setting" (Buchanan and Middleton, 1995). Rich and vivid descriptions of the scene works for the speaker and the recipients to *experience* the narrative event. According to Drew (1998), detailing in people's accounts often relates to moral accountability, in which descriptions are designed to address moral issues in people's experiences, and they are deployed by the participants to do moral work occasioned in the talk. Detailed account giving and narratives are discursive practice of moral accountability, which will be further discussed later in the data analysis of another extract.

Social nature of reported speech: Footing

One of the most analytically robust issues in this narrative is the use of reported speech. The reported speech of the speaker adopts multiple footings in presenting from two different positions about the Japanese people and war experiences as a POW. In other words, this observation is related to an analytic question of how the speaker expresses misalignments due to the change of his position from one point of time to another in his accounting for the past. The speaker's narrative provides a discourse example of the speaker's accountability and re-alignment of his position. It contains two sub-stories, and the speaker claims his changed position comparing two different occasions in the past from the position of the speaker-in-the-present as a narrator. The speaker's different positions situated at two different occasions in the past in encounters with the Japanese—"ten years after the war" (l. 2) and "some years later" (l. 39). The multiple positions (or voices), converged in this narrative by way of the reported speech, professes his claim about change and his redemption from the troubling past.

This narrative shows that the speaker's identities are situated in two different times of the past in his post-war life. The utterance of "Oh, my god, is that Japanese" (ll. 6-7) signals the speaker's perturbation with the presence of the Japanese in the park. This utterance recognises that what he was seeing at the park might be a potential trouble that was anticipated from the position of *Freddie-in-the past..* The speaker was reporting a problem with the encounter with the Japanese at a specific moment in his post-war life. He then immediately undermines such first-hand judgement. Why? Because the recipients could come back and easily point out that judgement as hastily formed, mistaken or biased without having a valid way of confirmation. So he manages such a possibility precisely in ll. 5-6 ("it could be Chinese or Thai"). This is attending to the recipient design in discursive analytic term. What it means is that this utterance is designed for those hearing the story, the recipients. With mobilisation of recipient design, he establishes the rationality of his initial judgement, hedging a comment from the recipients, especially two Japanese participants (i.e., the informant and the interviewer) in the interview. It is precisely this voice of rationality that is narrating the story. The narrative produced is occasioned at the present, in the interview. So, let's call this voice *Freddie-now* for the sake of the argument.

The speaker interactionally manages a possible danger of being biased or lacking a sufficient ground for rational judgement, while seeking the Japanese participants' alignment in line 10, where Freddie says "you know what I mean" to the rest of the interview group. But he maintains his original judgement, implying that there is a sufficient basis for it as he resoundingly draws his subjective view of the world then in lines 10-11 "to me they were Japanese." For Freddie there was no rational way of seeing and behaving toward the Japanese at that time. Here his subjectivity is made relevant and provides ground for his having a strong emotional reaction. For us to see how the speaker's subjectivity is accepted (or not contested), it is important to note that the speaker's subjectivity draws on his past experience of captivity as a POW. We can see the speaker himself mobilises his past, his biography as a relevant context to make a claim about the family he was seeing at the time. There may be even a sense of irony involved in conveying the magnitude of the encounter from a rhetorical contrast of an extremity of his perturbation from such an ordinary everyday experience of seeing a Japanese family in a park.

Language of the past as a way into the past

On the lines 13 onward where Freddie in the park overheard an utterance, *"Oi, koi"* which assured him that what he was seeing then was Japanese. This is a strong form of imperative, the English equivalent of "[Hey] you! Come [here]!" Freddie's reaction to the hearing of this Japanese utterance directly gets back to the time when it was used. For Freddie, it is the language of the camp, invoking a notion of lived experience of oppression and captivity in which the language of this kind was routinely used.

One might wonder why this term used in an ordinary, peaceful, contemporary situation by a Japanese father invokes notions of oppression and atrocities that took place nearly half a century ago. The answer to this question entails a context dependent nature of the use of the language, particularly in its prosodic and pragmatic aspects. *"Oi"* as an attention seeker, uttered to an addressee, conventionally, is used by a speaker with a superior or higher rank of social hierarchy (e.g., male over female, supervisor over subordinate, elder over younger, etc.) and to addressee, who is an in-group member of the social groups (e.g., family, work group). It is a term for the speaker to seek the addressee's attention without having to point to the addressee, which allows a particular social relation between the speaker and the utterer such as to be either a close family member or a total stranger.

The attention seeker comes with a wider range of prosodic and pragmatic allowance for its use, and therefore it depends on the social context to indicate a social nature of the relationship, whether it implies closeness, intimacy and trust, or to portray insult and be pejorative and oppressive. Without examining the context where the utterer is used, it is impossible to identify the meaning of the word. With the knowledge of the speaker's biography, namely his experience as a POW in Japan, it is reasonably inferred that the use of the term *"oi"* implies a highly problematic social relation—impoliteness, insult and making asymmetry of power. The term *"koi"*, a form of imperative to a higher degree, of a verb *kuru* (Eng.: to come) similarly works to mark the asymmetry of power between the addressee and the speaker in the situation used in terms of pragmatic meaning. It is used in a restricted social setting for it relies on its power to signify either intimacy or insult or offence. Again, it is typically used by a male speaker, to an "in-group" addressee in indicating some sense of acquaintance and closeness (therefore, no need for politeness), and varying prosodic characteristics allow the opposite effect (i.e., rudeness, insult, etc.)

In the given context when Freddie overheard *oi, koi*, it was used in an everyday family conversation in a public park between family members, marking a familial "in-group" (father - children or husband - wife) relationship. The important point here is that Freddie hears this term not in the same context as the utterer (i.e., in which a father speaks to the family members in a park) and the hearer of the story, but Freddie's hearing of the term immediately links to the experience at the POW camp in Japan with Japanese guards. The context dependent nature of utterances such as this show an evocative power of the language, that transcends the moment of the present (i.e., when the encounter was happening) and links the speaker, Freddie-in-the-park to the specific past, the experience in the Japanese camp.

In l. 16, his acknowledgement of "*oi, koi*", as in "I know that" constitutes the speaker not only as a knower of this language, but also invokes his war-time identity as a POW. There is a sense of "then-ness" or "there-ness" in terms of what he considers problematic—the troubling past. It brings the speaker into the exact place and time in the past where the utterance of "*oi, koi*" was used in association to the speaker's experiences, in this case the labour camp during the war. The speaker re-configures the context where this Japanese utterance was used. His "half" reluctance in turning around (l. 20) clearly signals that this is a deeply problematic situation for him.

The following description, from l. 21 onward, of the Japanese husband and wife's reciprocating act of photo-taking provides the circumstances or context to the problem he professes in the rest of the story. It explains how the anticipated problem was made to be reprehensible for his standard of conduct. The next few lines from line 26 explicate his code of conduct formulated as side comment and hypothetical internal dialogue/self talk ("I would norͨmally do in a case like that, °and I have done it (.) any times° (.) I would go out and say and "Excuse me >do you mind if<, would you like me to take a photograph of all of you?"). This comment establishes the speaker's virtue, how he normally would behave in relation to others. Here, what he considers his normative view of who he was as a person is made questionable. The voice of aversion and resistance to the possible action of kindness (i.e., to offer to take a photo) in line 37 "no, why should I." presented a conflict of two voices (Freddie-in-the-park and Freddie as a moral being) in which the troubling experience in the war-time past rationalises his failure of action. In other words, hearing of the language of the camp reveals a discrepancy between his normative view of who he is, the kind of

person he thinks he normally is, and the anomaly to such self concept, the way he acted under the circumstances.

Interview as an opportunity to re-configure the past

This is a missed opportunity for Freddie, personally. Furthermore, Freddie professed his regret as he moralises his past failure of action in public, in this case, in two *relational* ways: One way is that *Freddie-now* acknowledges *Freddie-in-the past* failing to act to his standard of conduct. The other way is by way of the interview talk with the recipients of the narrative. In other words, the telling of this narrative makes this missed opportunity both personally and publicly significant for *Freddie-now* and the interview participants. His morality, a right way to act to the situation was made available discursively to the recipients.

Freddie's unexpected encounter with the Japanese and hearing the language of the camp clearly invoke his troubled past. The experience in the POW camp during the war made him the kind of person whom he would not even approve of under the normal circumstances and everyday situations such as this. Otherwise, it would have been a place for him to demonstrate his virtue through an action—willingly offering helping hand to strangers in a public setting. The speaker's profound sense of regret is evident in the repeated utterance of ll. 38 ("I regretted that") with a resoundingly remorseful tone of voice.

The speaker's narrative competes with a parallel episode of the recent past, in which he had a similar encounter with a Japanese family in another public setting and the opportunity of taking pictures of the family arose. The description of the encounter and the setting goes to show that Freddie has now accepted a presence of the Japanese into his life. At this other encounter the situation was more distressing for *Freddie-in-the-past* who was invited to a Japanese person's home for a party, introduced to a Japanese family and took a picture using his own camera. However, then he behaved like a normal person without experiencing animosities or perturbation according his normative standard of conduct as to how a person should act and behave. It implies that the person who took a picture was no longer the same Freddie, which goes to show Freddie's acted-out changed position and attitude toward Japanese people. Ensuing Freddie's gloss of the narrative in line 46 "perhaps I was finally redeemed" formulates his moral sensibility and amounts to the speaker's accounting for change via claiming his redemption from the troubling past. The

narratives of two events at two different times are translated to a moral tale of personal redemption from the troubled past.

The narrative itself does not have a particular moral angle as *a priori* feature as it was told. The important point is the ways in which the narrative is told in relation to who is hearing it and how it is construed. Therefore, the narrative trajectory of the events being told is not predetermined. The rhetorical work in the interaction moralises Freddie's narrative by illustrating how the change had happened, including Freddie's failure of action in the first instance and the subsequent triumph over his experienced difficulty (i.e., how Freddie handled those events). In this respect the narrative of the events works to be a context to the subsequent turns and rhetorical moves that participants took in the interaction. It is the uptake in which the speaker's personal redemption was professed. The speaker's redemption was not an inherent, pre-designed element of the story both in terms of structure and content. This is an important point to highlight the social nature of narrative in construction of morality and social organisation of the past.

The telling of Freddie's redemption in the form of narrative is the locus of moral work, and Freddie's claim of redemption is worked up in the production of the narrative. Moral sensibility is not fixated, precursor to, and embedded in the narrative. Nor is there a conceptually driven moral framework and universal rule that governs the definition of redemption as a consequence of reconciliation with the Japanese and the war-time past. In the interview setting where the narrative was produced the participants themselves collaborate to do the morality work. Thus moral accountability of the past is an interactional accomplishment in which speaker's mobilisation of the experience narrative and the recipients participation resource Freddie's claim for redemption.

Moral accountability

This section explores further the notion of moral accountability by analysing another narrative produced at the same group interview as in Extract 1 . The analysis of this extract will expand on the previous discussion on morality addressed in the analysis of Extract 1. The analytical focus is placed on the ways in which participants use narrative as a discursive resource to do moral reasoning in terms of making sense of the past events. I will argue that this narrative is mobilised as resources to accomplish joint reasoning and moral accountability in the social organisation of the past. In this

extract, the analysis emphasises the interdependencies of the public and private significance of the remembered past.

The following extract comes from the same group interview as in the extract 1. There are 5 participants in the interview, including the interviewer. Prior to this segment, the ex-POW and other participants reminisced about memorable events, people and experiences in the reconciliation trip as they spoke of their views on reconciliation. Freddie, one of the POW told the following story:

Extract 2-1: Freddie's story of scalding

The extract 2-1 through 2-6 in full sequence is provided in Appendix 3.

```
50  Freddie    I think about, you are thinking (.) about
51             reconciliation, [and all that
52  Int.                       [Yes
53  Freddie    There's lots of little things have crept
54             into my mind (.)recently, you know,
55             things I'd not forgotten
56  Int.       Hum
57             (about       ). One particular act of
58             ki:ndness (.) happened to me in Tha:iland
59  Maki       Hum
60  Freddie    by Japane::se and that (.)
61             whether it's kindness or, I don't know.
62  Maki       Hum
63  (4.)
64  Freddie    and I've I probably have written this
67             Somewhere or other as well.
```

The speaker's uncertainty as a way of telling a story and making sense of the past

In this extract, one particular incident in the camp was recalled by Freddie. It is about the accident in which he got scalded with hot water as he was transporting a bucket of hot water with a fellow prisoner. The narrative was produced within the context of conversations with regard to the issue of reconciliation raised by the interviewer. The speaker conveys his uncertainty in making sense of this particular event in line 61 as preface to the story. The story telling provides a social forum for making sense of his past with others.[1]

The speaker's preface in lines 57-8 "One particular act of kindness happened to me in Thailand" expresses his concern and shows that he had thought about the meaning of the story as to how others would hear the story. The speaker's uncertainty in line 61 ("whether it's kindness, I don't know.") about the experience calls for the recipients' participation in making sense of it. The uncertainty is a way into why the

---

[1] For recounting of similar or equivalent experiences, see Sacks' discussion on second stories (1992a; 1992c) and also Goodwin's work for modification of the participation framework (1987).

telling of this story is relevant in considering the issue of reconciliation for the speaker telling this story.

Narrative of the past: detailed descriptions

In the next extract, Extract 2-2 immediately follows from the previous extract, the speaker begins the story of his experience at the camp in Burma prior to coming to Japan. The analytic focus is on the way the story is told with descriptive details and how such descriptions rhetorically construct situated identities and accomplishes moral accountability.

Extract 2-2

```
 68  Freddie   Working on the railway the railway
 69            where I was a concreter Bill (          )
 70            nearly half way to [Bumra
 71  Bill                         [(       )
 72  Freddie   the particular job I'd had on that
 73            particular day, there's another chap
 74            from Scotland, >I don't know his name<
 75            let's call him John
 76  Int.      Hum
 77  Freddie   Uh, we carried this metal can- metal bucket
 78            Thing
 79  Int.      Hum
 80  Freddie   on a pole, bit of wire bamboo pole
 81            with hot water
 82  Int.      humm hum
 83  Freddie   for tea, you see.  We had hot water and
 84            a few bits of stuff and we called it tea.
 85            It's one of these days it
 86            [was raining, it was very wet and everything
 87  Bill      [(       )
 88  Freddie   was slippery.  We slipped on a river bank
 89            somewhere.  We both got splashed with
 90            boiling water there, right [there ((slap))
 91  I & M                                [ohhh
 92  Freddie   you see:: right then, right↑
 93            ((showing with his gesture))
 94            I was splashed there ((hitting his thigh
 95            with his hand)) and for some unknown reasons
 96            he was better got splashed (.)
 97            there ((slaps his laps)) obviously,
 98            (              ). (.) Right (         )
 99            because we didn't have trousers on.
100            We just had bits of shorts, sh[orts
101  I/M                                     [ohh
102            Some shorts didn't have any- just a belt
103            .hh you know .hh.  Uh so, both (   [      )
104  Int.                                        [burned
```

As in the previous narrative in Extract 1, this narrative is filled with rich and detailed descriptions of the scenes, characters, and events and circumstantial information.

These are the features of "experience narrative" (Schrager, 1983). The accident was richly and vividly described, which produces the speaker's account of how the scalding accident happened. In addition to detailed descriptions, the speaker-narrator employs various rhetorical and verbal devices—namely changing tone of voice and intonation and speed of talk as well as non-verbal devices such as gestures and pointing actions. All of these devices are part of the speaker's discursive resources deployed in producing moral accountability as to who is responsible and how the person should take responsibility. Various situated identities of the speakers in relation to the character in the narrative and to the recipients of the narrative are constituted by footing shift, distancing and neutrality

Gestures as descriptions

The speaker's lively manner of narration adds to the rhetorical effect of experience narratives, especially with his gesture (e.g., standing up, slap the thighs and pointing to the body part which was subjected to the scalding) and uttering onomatopoeia of mimicking hot water splashing. Describing the very moment of the accident replays the moment of accident, and yet conveys the here-and-now-ness of the event, as if the past is brought back to the present (Holt, 1996). Holt observed that the prosodic aspect of the story telling is one of the notable characteristics in reported speech (Holt, 1996). The speaker changes tone of voice, pitch, and speed of utterances, especially to quote directly the other people's speech and view points as he narrated the story.

Descriptions and rhetorical contrasts to set up the agenda

In the next extract, as Freddie continues his story, he makes a resounding comment about his fellow prisoner's having a tattoo. He offered an extended description of what the tattoo looks like in contrast to him not having one and how Freddie and his fellow prisoner received a special treatment. This is crucial to the kind of conclusion to be drawn from the narrative.

Extract 2-3

```
105  Freddie   This is an interesting point here (.)
106            that (.) he was tattooed (.) both his legs
107            There
108  Int.      Hum
109  Freddie   I wasn't, and he↑ was.  And they were,
110            I don't, they were ladies, whether they
111            were naked ladies, or not I don't know
112            [they were typical la- anyway.
113  Maki      [(            )
114            I think he's got some on his arms.
115            [So, it wasn't long before they blistered
116            [hummm, I see, I see
117  ?         Hum
118  Freddie   And the next morning on (.) there was
119            Nothing
120            you couldn't, (              )
121            There was no↑ medical staff (      )
122            [doing about that.
123  Int.      [hum, hum
124            Well the next morning on, what they called
125            sick parade, they pick out the fittest and
126            all the sickest and that, that's it. (.)
127            >I  mean if you're sick, still went work
128            .hh, but<, on this occa↑sion (.) someone up
129            There decided, you know .hhh, we decided
130            There would be a Japanese medical team
131  M&I       Hum
132  Freddie   on their way to Burma.  And they were
133            in some tents just down the road where our
134            camp was, right.  We didn't know this (.)
135            and this medical team, our officer and a
136            Couple of their (.) >doctors whatever you
137            Might call them< came along and looking
138            at us
139  Maki      Hum
```

The story continues as Freddie makes a careful remark on the tattoo on his colleagues body. The description of the tattoo is a significant element to his reasoning process as to why he received medical treatment from the Japanese medical staff. Considering the circumstances of the POW camp, it was exceptional for the POWs to receive medical treatment especially with the non-life threatening nature of the injury. In lines 106-114, the speaker explicitly draws attention to the difference between the two prisoners: one (i.e., his friend) with tattoo and the other (i.e., the speaker) without ("This is an interesting point here. He was tattooed, both in [inaudible]. I wasn't, he was"). And he tells the story as to how having a tattoo may have affected the way they were treated.

Also the speaker's repeatedly mentioning of the design of the tattoo (in line 110, "they were naked ladies, whether they were naked ladies) with a mitigation (l.

111 "or not I don't know") is significant. He seems to be drawing a particular profile of his colleague who had tattoo with naked ladies. Imagine a kind of person who would have tattoos of naked ladies on arms and legs. This heavily relies upon the hearers' (and analysts') culturally knowledge (or commonsense in a given linguistic community in a particular historical era) of a tattooed individual, especially with naked ladies. The speaker's cultural norm about the tattooed individual is shared with others and made relevant here, albeit implicit. This contrast of two POWs, becomes crucial to his work of accountability later in the talk.

Another point being made in lines 121 onward is also pertinent to his original question of the motive of the Japanese medical team. He formulates a normative practice of the POW camp, pointing out the absence of medical staff (l. 121) and general disregard for the POWs' well being by the explaining of what "sick parade" is (ll. 124-7). The normative practice of the camp is contrasted with a special case of medical team, making a visit to the camp and consequently the medical treatment happened to be available as an exception (ll. 128-130, ll. 132-138). We may wonder why such details are necessary and what the speaker is up to to make these points.

Let us take further look at the extract as he continues the story about how they were treated by the Japanese medical staff.

Extract 2-4

```
140              And of course (.) I think they were
141              attracted to this chap's legs with his
142              [tattoos (.)showing on them, right
143  Int.        [hum
144  Freddie     more than mine cos I think the Japanese
145              they were a lot more fascinated with tattoos
146              and they picked him out you see↑
147              and of course, he must have said something
148              or they came on and saw my legs and of
149              course we had to tell them what happened (.)
150  Int.        Hum
151  Freddie     and then the officer saw that (     )
152              took us down to these tents (2.) and (.) uh
154              a little section where sort of (.)
155              curtained off and a chair and I sat there
156              and my friend Jock he went in (.) A bit
157              later on well, a little while went by
158              I didn't hear any screams, or anything
159              I thought, oh that sou- sounds all right
160              hhh((laugh)). A bit worried about this
161              of course .hh ((laughing voice)), and he
162              came out and he got his legs like that (.)
163              all ba:ndaged up [posh poo:hwa:h, you know
164                              [hum hum (              )
165              he went he went out (2.) and I went in.
166              (.) And then (.) cos whoever did it must
```

```
167                 have spoken English cos he asked that tattoo
168                 and I said I didn't have tattoos and
169                 that was it. Anyway a procedure was
170                 roughly this.  He just swabbed everything
171                 off. I and he got some lint.
172                 He cut some lint like a jigsaw puzzle
173                 like a jigsaw puzzle, little puzzle (    )
174                 pieces (.) He put his these little bits all
176                 Separately on there before he put a dressing
177                 on anyway. (.) He even wrote us a (.)
178                 note to say we haven't got to work (.)
179                 till that was better .hhhh, it's true
180                 Bill it's true ((laughing voice))
181   Int.& M     Hahahahaha
182   Bill        But did you go to work?
183   Freddie     No, not not for about a week you know
184   Maki        (              ) ((laughing))
185               Our doctor our doctor had to say you know
187               (.) that we were fit
188   Int.        ((laugh))
189   (.)
```

In lines 140-142 and 144-149, the speaker talks about the treatment procedures of the Japanese medical staff, drawing on a speculation that the Japanese medical staff treated them because they were fascinated by the injury on the tattooed skin. While suspending this speculation, the speaker gives extensive and detailed experiential accounts of the delicate and methodical procedure of the medical treatment given by the Japanese. The detailed description of the carefully administered, novel technique of applying jigsaw-like pieces of lint (ll. 151-179) conveys extraordinary and exceptional nature of the entire experience of receiving this medical treatment. He also tells he had doubts about the motive of the Japanese medical staff. For instance, he expresses his concern toward his mate by commenting that he did not hear any screams during the time he was in the tent to receive treatment. This seems to imply that the Japanese medical staff did not apply any rough treatment to the patient (ll. 158-160). Also, the speaker's description of his friend with bandages to protect the injured part (ll. 162-163) seems to be an evidence to the same effect, that he was treated humanely. The speaker tells all these details, while suspending to offer his interpretation, and making this circumstantial evidence available for the hearers. The speaker's fine details about how the procedure went make reasonable his interpretation that this may be an act of kindness by the Japanese. The way he tells his story with all these descriptions contributes to the reasoning as to whether this special medical treatment is an act of kindness or an experiment on the part of the Japanese medical team.

Dilemma, rhetorical contrast

The entire story and its rich descriptive details are oriented to the extraordinariness of the treatment by the Japanese medical staff. Throughout the narrative, a series of rhetorical contrasts are made—Freddie and the tattooed friend, the extraordinary treatment of the injury from a non-fatal accident, the unfamiliar sophisticated medical procedure in a POW camp where such a sophisticated medical treatment was least expected for POWs, and the special granting of the sick leave when such notice was non-existent. These contrasting details make it very difficult to see the motive of the Japanese medical team. Ambiguity of the incident would cast doubts on the initial speculation that the speaker and his colleague were subjected to a medical experiment or "practice," whereas it may still leave a possibility that it was simply out of a genuine medical interest. The speaker's uncertainty is a resource to generate a suspended doubt and a potentially problematic judgement as to what the motive was of the Japanese medical team by way of giving the special medical treatment. The rhetorical power of this narrative depends on the speaker's doubts about the motive of the Japanese medical team.

Whether having tattoos or not, as the speaker renders it significant here, is concerned with the speaker's ascription of a motive for the actions by the Japanese. His tattooed friend may have been a reason for receiving this special treatment for an instrumental reason. Yet, if whether having tattoo or not is a criterion for the Japanese to do practice on the subjects, then Freddie having been treated equally with John makes it difficult to explain the motive of the Japanese medical team unless it is other than medical "practice." The detailed descriptions that the speaker had worked up is oriented to this very point of how the entire experience was to be evaluated. In other words, the speaker *revisits* the past event by way of telling this narrative and re-addresses the issue that was not explicable at the time of the event. The telling of the narrative engages participants in the moral reasoning of the past experience in interaction. The various detailed descriptions, explanations, and side-comments are a discursive resource for the speaker and the participants to make sense of the significance of the event.

In the next section, I will discuss the ways in which the participants' uptake of the narrative became an interactional opportunity for moral reasoning.

Moral reasoning as discursive practice

So far I have demonstrated that the speaker's doubts and uncertainty of the past actions of the Japanese medical staff created an interactional setting to tell a story of the speaker's experience and to socially make sense of it. In particular, the speaker's attribution of the motive and sense-making of the event are resourced in the telling of the narrative. In what follows, we will examine how moral sensibility of the personal past was made available and relevant to the rest of the participants and establishes the public relevance of the problematic past in joint remembering of the reconciliation activities.

Extract 2-5

```
        190  Int.     [°hummm°
        191  Freddie  [Now then.  This is a question (.) that
        192           I never been able to answer
        193           Was that an act of kindness?  (3.)
        194           Or was it (.) they needed somebody to
        195           Practice on? .hh
        196  Bill     Of course they need someone to practice on.
        197  Freddie  .hh (.)
        198  Int.     Hum
        199  Freddie  Or is this just one of these things you'll
        200           never explain.
        201  Int.     [Are you asking me↑ (.)
        202  Freddie  [(            )
        203  Int.     my opinion
        204  (.)
        205  Freddie  Well, no (.) [no I'm just saying
        206  Int.                   [my-my, yeah↑
        207  Freddie  [generally no, generally no
        208  Int.     [you are asking (.) yourself, °yeah?°
        209  (.)
        210  Freddie  And, it's one of these things over these
        211           years I thought to myself well (.)
→       212           we were meant we were meant (.) to spill
        213           that water.  So without that experience
        214  Int.     [hum
```

In line 191, Freddie poses a question whether what the Japanese medical team did was an act of kindness or whether they "needed somebody to practice on." This is a move of the speaker treating the interview as an interactional opportunity to address and discuss the meaning and implications of this scalding accident and the subsequent medical treatment. The speaker's doubts and uncertainty became an interactional resource for the participants to work on what all these acts meant and what the motive of the Japanese (Goodwin, 1987; Middleton and Curnock; 1995).

Let us start with Freddie's delicate phrasing of the questions in lines 191 onward and the way he gets responses. Freddie has three kinds of interpretation of the events at hand. One is the medical treatment is an act of kindness; second, it is the explanation of the Japanese medical staff's motive to practice on the POWs. Third explanation remains equivocal and unanswerable. These are highly sensitive questions to ask, knowing the context of the event and the nature of the interview.

We shall now take a closer look at the exchanges to examine accountability and management of the interaction in terms of sensitivity. Indicating a change of the narrative mode ("now then" in line 191), Freddie, the speaker opens up to the recipients a question of whether it is an act of kindness or practice. The question is specifically addressed to the participants, mainly to the Japanese hearers (i.e., the interviewer and the Japanese informant) with a long pause in line (l. 193) waiting for an answer. Without getting an answer, Freddie asks another question, whether the Japanese medical staff needed someone to practice on (l. 194-5). The brief in-breath at the end of the question (l. 195) signals the speaker's difficulty in bringing up delicate issues to the recipients. Bill, another ex-POW participant, in line 196 immediately responds to this affirmatively, assuring the treatment was for practice.

Another Freddie's uptake of in-breath (l. 197), again, signals his difficulty with accepting Bill's position. Likewise the interviewer's ambiguous "hum" in line 198, displaying an equivocal stance at this point. This is a very difficult interactional moment, considering the varying backgrounds and personal biographies of the participants involved—Freddie, the ex-POW speaker-narrator-protagonist of the story, Bill, the ex-POW friend of the speaker, the Japanese interviewer, who has very little knowledge of life in POW camps during the war, and the Japanese informant. Freddie, following from uptakes of Bill and the interviewer, offers the third explanation of no explanation (ll. 199-200). The interviewer's turn in l. 201 indicates that she takes this as her accountability question (ll. 201 "Are you asking me?" & l. 203 "my opinion"). With a brief silence (.) indicating no one is taking Freddie's question to be directly accountable, Freddie reassures this does not hold the interviewer accountable (l. 205, "Well, no (.)") and produces a repair (l. 205, "[no I'm just saying"), which is overlapped with the interviewer's acknowledgement of her being nominated to account for it (l. 206). In the second overlap Freddie re-emphasises that the question is not to seek accountability from the interviewer (l. 207, "generally no, generally no") and the interviewer displays her alignment to Freddie (l.

208). The interviewer not only displays her empathy to Freddie, but also renounces her accountability on this issue. These overlaps (ll. 201-209) show the delicate nature to the question, and the speaker Freddie and the interviewer attend to managing the interaction, orienting to a potentially problematic interaction and breakdown. Freddie's in-breaths and overlaps with the interviewer provide examples of discursive management of sensitivity in discussing a problematic issue.

So, how then is the significance of the narrative event produced by the speaker and how is it made relevant to the others present at the interview? The questions are related to Freddie's moral accountability and sensibility of the past event as he displays his reasoning of this equivocal event. With a recognisable pause, Freddie reveals his reasoning and gloss on the significance of the event in line 210. Suggesting he had spent a long time to make sense of the experience in the past (presumably this is not the first time), his reasoning in ll. 212-3 ("we were meant to (.) spill that water" invokes a notion of fate. He ascribes some kind of a link between the scalding accident and the subsequent medical treatment by the Japanese, but not in terms of either of his earlier hypotheses. The speaker's experience of injury and subsequent medical treatment at the camp is now configured as somehow related but not attributed to either Japanese kindness or their motive of medical practice. Does this mean that the speaker has not been reconciled with the troubling past, captivity by the Japanese? He never outwardly declares his position of reconciliation, but does this mean that he has not yet reconciled? I would argue that a discursive approach to reconciliation does not aim to look for a statement such as "I have been reconciled" as an evidence of reconciliation. Rather, we should look at how the troubling past is recounted by the speaker and how the significance of such a past is jointly reconfigured interactionally by the participants.

Extract 2-6

```
213  Freddie    that water.  So without that experience
214  Int.       [hum
215  Freddie    at the ti:me you would have hated all the
216             [Japanese in sight (.) those we didn't ee:
217             Even you know↑, it was the troop side (.)
218             It's just that a little bit there (.)
219             now whether they went on up to Burma (.)
220             whether they survived up there or whether
221             (.) they they, cos they were meant to be
223             tending their own wounded, a lot of their
224             wounded coming passed, coming down (.)
225             through us.  Some of them were in te↑rrible
226             state that we sort of felt sorry for them.
```

```
227              This is wh:y the Burma veteran thing out
228              in Japan was all a bit of a link with me
229              you think to yourself I saw a lot of poor
230              souls coming down from Burma, back to
231              Singapore when we were on that railway (.)
232              towards the end of the (war/railway?).
233    Bill      War is a waste, isn't it↓.
234    Freddie   There you are.
235    Bill      Now we are talking about another one
236    (.)
237    Bill      There you are
```

A collective moralisation of the speaker's personal experience of the past

In accounting for the consequences of the Japanese medical staff's motive as why he received the medical treatment, "we were meant to spill that water", Freddie claims his current position toward the Japanese in ll. 213 & 215, stating his experience of receiving the special medical treatment helped him to see the Japanese (ll.213-217 ("Without that experience, at the time you would have hated the Japanese"). How is this implicit claim for the change formulated as part of his moral accountability? Let us unpack Freddie's account of witnessing the misery of wounded Japanese soldiers in Burma is to be construed (in lines 217-232). Here he is reporting a miserable state of the Japanese soldiers, whose wounds are far worse than his, but were not receiving any medical attention from their own medical staff. The medical staff who treated Freddie and his colleague would be the same people who would have attended to and provided medical treatment to the wounded soldiers. This observation on hand remains to be a puzzle to his question of the motive, but on the other hand, it makes a point that he was able to see suffering regardless of the enemy or their own.

War and suffering as common experience

Freddie's account offers his subjectivity of the reality and circumstances of the narrated events and his sympathy to those Burma veterans ("Some of them were in terrible state that we sort of felt sorry for them") from a soldier's point of view beyond a national (and us versus enemy) boundary. The state of emotion ("felt sorry") conveys authenticity of the witnessed event as well as the rationality of the speaker at the time of witnessing the miserable state of the injured soldiers. Both the claimed emotional state of the speaker then and the footing in a collective voice of "we" are oriented to the common experience of misery of war, which transcend the us/POWs and them/the Japanese as enemy distinction. It shows that everyone suffers from war.

Furthermore, he brings this general claim about the war to a personal level as in lines 227-232 "This is why the Burma veteran thing out in Japan was all a bit of a link with me you think to yourself I saw a lot of poor souls coming down from Burma." The speaker's experience of the scalding accident in the camp is understood in both terms—collective and private significance of the past.

Rhetorical commonplace in the narrative

In a sense, this is a speaker's dilemma about war. On one hand, everyone suffers from war, yet on the other, his experience of captivity as a POW nevertheless cannot be ignored. The gloss that another ex-POW participant gave, "war is a waste, isn't it" in l. 233 works as what Billig (1996) calls "rhetorical commonplace" (see also Wetherell, and Potter, 1992). Rhetorical commonplaces are often used in contentious argumentation to close down the dilemmatic discussion such as this dilemmatic talk about the scalding accident and misery of war. This rhetorical commonplace fits nicely to the moral of the narrative and works as the significance of reconciliation for the ex-POW participants and the present others in the interview as they see that both sides, the British POWs and the Japanese troops in Burma equally suffered from misery of war. The rhetorical commonplace pigeonholes Freddie's dilemma of the situation. What is otherwise difficult to resolve and settle with is now translated into and reconfigured to a morally sensible conclusion that everyone agrees on. The dilemmatic past is made sense of discursively in the telling of the narrative and the subsequent talk of their interpretation in the joint remembering of the problematic past. Moreover, the significance of the past established in the talk is made relevant to the present circumstances of the participants. Note the brief exchanges in lines 233-237 implicitly links to current affairs, which refers to the conflict in Kosovo at the time of the interview.

Reconciliation: constant re-working and sense-making of the past

The speaker's position of reconciliation was made relevant to the interpretation of the story and its implications to Freddie's position on reconciliation located within a collective position as a POW.[2] Freddie's discursive work (i.e., the telling of the

---

[2] Bruner (1990a) states that subjectivity is shared and "by virtue of participation in culture, meaning is rendered public and shared. Our culturally adapted way of life depends upon shared meanings and shared concepts and depends upon shared modes of discourse for negotiating differences in meaning and interpretation."

narrative) not only gives life to the past experience to the present significance retrospectively, but also implicitly aids him to portray and present himself to the recipients as a person with moral sensibility who was, even then, at the time of captivity able to see war as the commonly experienced misery of humanity. It is within this context of Freddie's moral sensibility and moral reasoning in which the particulars of the accident and the general and shared sense of the war experience were enmeshed and the narrative in interaction accounts for his survival of that injury.

The speaker is constantly working out the significance of the experience by adopting different positions (and perspectives) in interaction within interdependencies of personal v. collective relevance of the past experience. The past event was constantly re-configured and becomes a topic that then was extended to his concern with morality and representation of personal integrity. The interview provides discursive means where the speakers, the POWs do work on sense-making and accounting for his survival in order to answer a question of why I was "chosen" to live through a potentially fatal injury within an extreme case of the human condition—the lived experience of wasted humanity. The interview provided a setting where the participants displayed their understanding of the moral of the story from various footings and situated positions/identities for interactionally emerging practical concern, in this case, the issue of reconciliation. The discursive approach to reconciliation focuses on the ways of the participants' talking about the problematic past events, for instance, amicably without being hostile to one another and bringing off some aggressive points from the event being shared, regardless of their cultural, biographical differences and backgrounds. Some events are never explained and accounted fully, in this case, whether what Freddie received for his scalding injury was an act of kindness or act of medical practice. The discursive reconciliation entails the way he told the story and revealed his reasoning, and the way in which he told the other participants how he made sense of the events.

Chapter summary

Accounting for change with the use of narrative and footing

One of the analytic implications of this narrative pertains to the way the speakers professed change and redemption by telling a narrative. Different footings were employed in the form of reported speech, which enables the speaker to highlight a

moment of the change when the speaker reconfigured the past action as failure and marks another moment when he took up a similar following opportunity to act on the failure of the past action. The interview setting provided an interactive opportunity for the speaker to address a mismatch of alignments (different positions: *Freddie-in-the-past* and *Freddie-now*) concerning the attitude toward the Japanese (for the work on this mismatch of discursive alignments (Middleton, 1996; 1997a). Individual claims to experience are made collectively relevant through the deployment of remembering as a discursive issue (Middleton, 1996, p. 396).

A change in footing implies a change in the alignment we take up to ourselves and the other present as expressed in the way we manage the production or reception of an utterance. A change in our footing is another way of talking about a change in our frame of events, without explicitly stating one's change. The analysis of this extract emphasises the discursive positioning, in particular the ways in which that participants over the course of the interaction, constantly change their footing, these changes being a persistent feature of natural talk. Reported speech in this narrative is crucial to do footing, in which different positions are realised and reconfigured over time and a change of the speaker's position was identified as a consequence of the participation in the reconciliation trip. Footing (or alignment) shifts are often understood as achieved neutrality (Goffman, 1981; Potter, 1996). For example, people, in confronting a contentious description of some state of affairs, tend to produce neutrality as a quote from a particular speaker or to treat it as what people in general have claimed. Often quoted and reported speech is used to avoid alignment as a way of distancing themselves from the contentious issue (Potter, 1996). In this extract, the roles of the speaker is not a narrator with a neutral voice. The speaker manoeuvres multiple interactional roles—presenting at least three different voices: Freddie-in the-past (when the failure of action occurred), Freddie-now (when he was able to behave according to his normative code of conduct) and the narrator (who manages the interactional logistics such as recipient design) at the moment of telling the narrative. These distinctions have implications for accountability (Potter, 1996).

Talk as resource for moral and identity work

The self-talk and the telling of it work to warrant the speaker's position, "Freddie-in-the-past," producing an account for why he could not act the way he normally would. The self-talk reported in this extract is not represented as a verbatim account of the

past. Instead, it works to be a discursive resource, for the speaker to do moral work of redemption. The reconciliation trip afforded the opportunity for him to re-work discursively his war experiences and their impact. This narrative of redemption claims and warrants the changed position, but it is done in such a way that his position was re-formulated and reconfigured interactionally, moment-by-moment, in a local context.

As I argued in the analysis of the previous two extracts, story telling and its uptake play an important role in interaction where morality is in the public domain and participants discuss, interpret and evaluate the meaning of the past experiences and implications. Social shared-ness and situated-ness of morality work had been a main analytical focus. In this view reconciliation is a constant re-working of the meaning of the past, occasioned in the storytelling and discursive practices. The analysis highlights the social nature of the narrative: the participants' discursive work—the experience narrative, experiential and circumstantial details and scene setting—is a precursor to moral work in the interdependencies of private and collective significance of the past events and actions. The interdependencies are formed at two levels in making sense of the past events at issue. One is the speaker's subjective understanding of the past, and the other is that the speaker's sense of the past is shared and reconfigured in the present interaction. The significance of the past and its moral sensibility are managed discursively in mobilising relevant particulars. From a perspective of discursive psychology, the POW participants' doubts and uncertainties of their past experiences at the POW camps work as a discursive resource to do the moral work of redemption and reconciliation.

CHAPTER 7

Reconciliation as discursive accomplishment

Introduction

The final chapter presents the conclusion of the thesis and its implications for future studies. The first aim is to integrate the theoretical issues addressed in Chapter 1 with the discussions in the empirical sections, Chapters 3 to 6. I recapitulate the key analytic points in the empirical sections, on identity in Chapter 3, accountability in sensitivity management in Chapters 4 and 5, and moral accountability in redemption narratives in Chapter 6. I then revisit theoretical issues addressed in Chapter 1 on reconciliation and social remembering and draw a conclusion on the discursive approach to reconciliation and social remembering. The second aim is to address theoretical implications for future research and propose some research directions to extend the current study. Some of the discussion pertains to methodological implications of discursive psychology and discourse analysis in relation to various other theoretical perspectives that were introduced in earlier chapters.

Reconciliation as discursive accomplishment

Throughout the thesis, I have argued and provided evidence that reconciliation is a discursive accomplishment. The thesis examines what it is for the former British prisoners of war to be reconciled with the experience in captivity by the Japanese during WWII and their post-war life of living with experiences of harrowing events. The discursive approach, taking a critical stance to orthodox psychology, sets out to study reconciliation as social practices, which are situated within communicative activities in a particular social and cross-cultural setting. The analytic focus is placed on people's discursive practices of interview talk and letter writing; the analysis does not assume that remembering is a cognitive process isolated from social activities and the environment. In similar vein, reconciliation does not imply a change of mental state or attitude, as it were an inner conflict where two different values and world views need to be resolved within the mind of an individual. Nor does it mean to

achieve equilibrium in the mind, eradicating hostile attitudes or animosity toward the former enemy or whoever evokes such reactions. The discursive view of reconciliation argues against a cognitive model in which reconciliation is reduced to mental phenomena in terms of the content and mechanism (i.e., what it is to be reconciled and how it happens).

Norval's study (1998) on reconciliation has cast a grain of scepticism over the South African TRC's potential contributions to exert a complete settlement and closure on the past wrongdoings of the perpetrators of Apartheid both in public and private domains. The thesis concurs with Norval's point that the cognitive model would be simply implausible to apply because of the complex nature of reconciliation practices and various parameters involved. The problem of this cognitive modelling of reconciliation stems from the notion of the idealisation of mental processes, which fails to embrace the complexity of reconciliation processes and does not account for variability of views and opinions. The discursive approach to studying reconciliation, focused on talk and texts, makes visible people's dilemmas and ambiguous positions about the problems of the past and being reconciled with them. The analysis teases out subtleties of interview participants' discursive moves and positioning in performing social actions, while managing the interview talk with a display of sensitivity to present and non-present others.

One of the methodological points made in this study is that the research has provided a social setting for the ex-POWs to talk to a Japanese person, who belongs to a ethnic-cultural category of the former perpetrator-captor. The research interview is the setting, where a discursive reconciliation is accomplished vis-à-vis a cultural other. In the conventional view of research process, which has rigidly defined stages of research activities, the interview is regarded merely as a mode of data collection technique. On the contrary, the discursive approach to reconciliation looks at the research as part of social practice, and therefore the entire research process becomes a process of discursive reconciliation. For example, with regard to ethical procedures and clearance, the issues related to ethics became a topic of practical concern, and they were handled by the participants and the researcher interactionally.

The empirical sections of the thesis have documented discursive practices of both talk and texts concerning the issues of reconciliation and apology. Starting with the analysis of the seven letters to the editor of *The Independent*, the discussion provided a gateway into the key analytic concepts of the thesis, identity and

accountability. It also illustrated how the notion of apology is invoked in the use of identity descriptions in the letters as response to the staged protest against the Japanese emperor's visit. Multiplicity of opinions and sentiments expressed in the letters page illuminates a performative nature of identity descriptions, which accomplish social actions of blaming, justifying, forgiving and seeking reconciliation by those who have a stake and interest (e.g., the former POW veterans and their family members and other members of the community). The analysis of the letters page identified people's variability of positions and ideological dilemmas about the issues of reconciliation and apology. Among the various rhetorical devices used in performing social actions, mobilisation of identity and its descriptions is a viable and salient feature which resources social remembering and social organisation of the past. Other rhetorical devices include experience narrative, management of neutrality, rhetorical commonplaces, footing and management of stake and interest, cultural identity and ethnicity as membership category, and interdependencies of public and private relevance of the past.

Sensitivity management is one of the major discursive businesses that members, the POW participants orient to during the course of the interviews. Reconciliation was examined in terms of sensitivity management. By sensitivity management, people display their ways of living with the troubling past in amicable and non-aggressive manner of talk. Such discursive practices were analysed in terms of construction of cultural otherness and ethnification processes as to how the POW participants formulate a problem of a particular cultural practice of the POW camp during the war in talking about a rice diet. Central to this particular analysis is the way in which the ex-POWs claimed their problem of the rice diet to the Japanese interviewer. In the talk about rice diet, rice was a prevalent conversational topic and was used as membership category, which all sorts of cultural knowledge of rice in a particular time and place were invoked. The fine-grain analysis inspired by conversation analysis looked at turn-taking and sequential organisation. The analysis has shown that the asymmetry of cultural knowledge between the POW participants and the interviewer were made relevant as the key concern of the conversation. The conversation analysis has revealed the ethnification process, in which the POW participants ethnify the interviewer as Japanese who is a knower of this cultural practice. Ethnification is a way of nominating the speaker in the next turn and making her accountable for the topic at hand, in this case, formulating the problem with a rice

diet in the Japanese camp. In so doing, the interlocutors attend to the topic of rice turn by turn, whilst displaying their knowledge of the cultural practice of rice diet and establishing a shared understanding of what it was to live in the POW camp in Japan. The talk about rice is a discursive work of accounting for otherness, and it was accomplished jointly through discursive construction of cultural otherness and the ethnification process. The accountability thus entails the participants' management of sensitivity. The discourse analysis as to how accountability for the past is managed sensitively has provided the empirical basis for the thesis' claim that reconciliation is a discursive accomplishment.

The theme of sensitivity management was explored also with respect of accountability for the past by examining the ex-POW's participants' recurring use of Japanese words and phrases. I call those terms "the language of the past" as they were clearly rooted in their experience of captivity in the POW camp during the war. The use of the language of the past is potentially problematic and would have created some unpleasant and even hostile interactional moments (e.g., explicit blaming of the Japanese and holding the interviewer accountable for Japanese soldiers' atrocities). The interviewer has no lived experience or very little general knowledge about the war-time Japan, let alone of the operation of prisoners of war camps in Japan. She displayed her difficulty with the archaic and specialised use of the Japanese terms as they were used in the middle of English utterances in the interview. Rather than clinging to a sociolinguistic notion of code-switching in which the speaker 'consciously' switch two languages to exercise power in social relations, the analysis focused on the situated use of the language of the past. The analysis informs that the speaker's use of the language of the past is to formulate and bring off implicitly their problem of communicating with the Japanese guards and other workers at the camp. The POW participants jointly formulated this problem by demonstrating what it was like to live in a totally unfamiliar linguistic environment all of sudden, for instance, being given orders by the Japanese guards and asked to do a roll call in Japanese without having any induction to Japanese language and culture. Instead of the explicit telling of, and describing, the communication problem at the Japanese camp, the POW participants demonstrated the problem interactionally vis-à-vis the Japanese interviewer. This again requires the interlocutors' interactional sensitivity. The close examination of the situated use of the language of the past has revealed the asymmetry of linguistic knowledge between the POW participants and the

interviewer, which resulted in interactional misalignment. The speakers picked up on the so-called potential interactional landmines with which the next interactional turn could have led to a conversational breakdown, but managed to achieve an amicable interaction by avoiding taking up the issue further and instead producing laughter, humour and ironic statements. These conversational devices were analysed in terms of recipient design, that is, speaker's orientation to how others would hear a particular utterance and how uptakes and responses were produced accordingly. The speaker's production of humour, irony and laughter are discursive resources to manage the interaction, which requires sensitivity to one another. The analysis does not assume that these linguistic resources were to interpret speaker's intentions and motives underlying their utterances. Rather, it has illustrated that accountability work of the problematic past was produced locally vis-à-vis a cultural-linguistic other in an interactional setting.

The discussion of the language of the past has an important implication for the concept of time. It has led us to reconsider the linear notion of time. The Japanese terms used by the POW participants have a function of transcending the present time to a particular moment of the past, pointing to a particular experience or an event in question in the interview, while sharing the experience or event with present others. Storied lives invoked by the use of language of the past allow not only the speakers but also the hearers to reflect upon their experiences of life through constructing and understanding stories. This point concurs with Bruner's notion of narrative psychology (1990a; 1990b). For Bruner, narrative is not merely a genre of discourse, but a mode of thought and action describing the means by which "people organise their experience in, knowledge of, and transactions with the social world" (Bruner, 1990a, p. 35; Edwards, 1997, p. 269). Narratives are not considered as mere mental representation of historical truth as they are remembered, but a human activity doing social action with others. The language of the past used in the telling of the narratives facilitates our activity of remembering the past.

This has an important implication for moral accountability in terms of identity and self, in the act of stating who you are, and the change at a particular moment. This issue was explored through the examination of what we call redemption narratives focusing on reported speech and footing shift. The analysis shows that the speaker made a claim about the change, by describing the discrepancy between the way he normally sees himself and the way he behaved and felt with the presence of the

Japanese at an ordinary encounter in his post-war life. The speaker addressed his difficulty with dealing with the Japanese when he heard the language of the past, which invoked his wartime experience of captivity in the POW camp. The redemption narrative captures the two different positions that the speaker put forward in order to illustrate that the significance of the past experience was reconfigured as a consequence of the participation in the reconciliation trip. He claimed his redemption as a moral conclusion of the narrative. Here, again we can see Bruner's notion of action orientation to narratives of redemption. The speaker is doing moral work in the telling of the narrative by way of stating his change of views toward the Japanese at two different points of time.

Another analytic concern about the redemption narratives and claims was addressed whether recalled experiences are a feature of a particular biography and of personal significance or part of a collective experience of more general significance. This study has examined remembering as an interactional accomplishment. The analysis has highlighted ways in which interdependencies of experience, as privately and publicly relevant, are mobilised in social practices of reconciliation. Various rhetorical features of talk vis-à-vis the cultural "other" have identified the ways in which the participants were oriented to cultural identity and membership categories-- attend to issues of redemption and moral accountability of the troubling past concerning the personal and public significance of their war time experience.

These redemption narratives can be viewed as biographical accounts that are organised in terms of life review and life audit (Butler, 1963; Coleman, 1974; 1999). Studies of reconciliation benefit from the contribution to the field of social gerontology and sociology of ageing. They advocated a biographical turn, the importance of looking at biography as a relevant issue. What is missing in these studies, however, is methodological, that is, in the way this biographical turn is pursued in the data analysis. The current discursive analytic study provides for the sociological work on ageing the empirical evidence of the relevance of biography. In other words, the discursive approach illustrates that the participants (including caregivers and therapists alike) themselves are making relevance to biography and autobiography interactionally in both institutional and non-institutional settings. In a project of life review and life audit, just like reminiscence work, the participants make sense of the past events and experiences through interaction with others, while attending to membership and moral order of the past.

I have consistently argued that history, biography, culture are not background issues that are suppressed or to be ignored as something that would compromise the integrity of the analytic claims. They are often seen as impurity, or extra-linguistic element, which is imported to aid the analysis. This is a vexing concern for conversation analysts, ethnomethodologists and some discursive psychologists, because the analysis itself depends on the use of the language, which is inherently a reflexive process. I have taken a position that history, biography, culture are analyst's as well as member's categories. These categories were mobilised to do the business of accountability and express their concerns in their communicative activities of interview talk and letter writing. Also, they are used as discursive resource to establish and claim identities. The thesis provided evidence that reconciliation is studiable in terms of identities and accountability in people's communicative activities—the joint action of remembering.

Challenge and remit of discursive psychology

The thesis has advocated the discursive view of reconciliation. It is based on the empirical observation of the members' means of, and of the very moment in, which talk is being managed sensitively. The participants' problems with the past and changed positions were professed in a delicate formulation, which generated amicable talk. This manner of talk affords a claim for reconciliation. A close conversation analytic attention to turn-taking and sequential organisation have illuminated seemingly mundane features of conversation such as production of laughter, humour, and irony (just to name a few) as salient to phenomena of discursive reconciliation as social practice and accomplished moment-by-moment in situ vis-à-vis cultural other. The discursive analysis of the interview data makes visible how reconciliation is achieved in talk. It can be said that the analysis takes place at a micro-level in looking at a research interview where the participants handle locally turn by turn conversational landmines of potentially problematic topics and disturbing details of the past events, while reminiscing the past in a non-confrontational manner.

While the discursive analytic approach is primarily concerned with here-and-now-ness of construction of identity and performance and accomplishment of accountability, it still remains that the question of how a person's history (biography and autobiography) and collective history (cultural, social, national, etc.) are linked to these discursive views of multiplicity of identities and positioning that operate beyond

the chronology of time, and place and physical reality. The non-linear concept of time addressed in Chapter 5 has implications for our theoretical understanding of identity. To address this concern, I make use of discursive psychological view of ontology (Harré and Gillet, 1994). Harré and Gillet propose two ontologies termed as discursive ontology (or Vygotskian ontology for psychology) as opposed to Newtonian ontology (a mechanical world picture). An ontology, defined as "a systematic exposition of the assumptions about the basic categories of beings admitted to the universe assumed in some scientific field" (p. 29) entails two steps. One is "to define the location system by which things and events in our "world" are to be individuated" (p. 30). The location system is determined by space and time. We use that system "to individuate the thinglike entities of the Newtonian world." In other words, this system would help us answer the questions such as where is it? Which is it? And when is it? The ontology for discursive psychology does not subscribe to the Newtonian scheme of causality that links things and events together. Similarly, as for space in terms of a system of location for the basic entities, the discursive psychological ontology is based on an array of people, as opposed to the physical space. This idea resonates with the importance of studying interactions, discursive practices, social relations in which identity claims and accountability work are situated and performed in examining social organisation of the past. The study of Alzheimer's sufferers (Sabat and Harré, 1992) provides empirical evidence for the notion of discursive ontology. The discourse materials gathered for the current thesis study can be looked at from this perspective to further our understanding of construction, continuity and change of identities (or self).

Let us move away from this micro-level analysis and direct our gaze to broader social ideological issues. With regard to collective memory and history, we may explore a question of how discourses of reconciliation emerge and change over time, say in the span of 50 years and how such change impacts the ways in which people perform discursively with issues to do with reconciliation and apology. For example, anniversaries and commemoration rituals and ceremonies that are exercised every year, decade or millennium produce a discourse specific to time and place. Social organisation of the past is visible in joint action of remembering and forgetting occasioned in a specific time and space. In a more generic level, consider a phrase such as "can forgive but not forget" in the letters page. This is one of rhetorical tropes that were commonly and frequently used by the interview participants as well. I came

across a popular use of a particular rhetorical trope and commonplace (or maxim) in various other textual materials I collected in the earlier stage of the research. Perhaps there is a promising research direction to revive these materials and examine the way in which people make closure to, or settlement in, the seemingly unforgivable past wrongdoings and transgressions of others.

In this vein, a diachronic change of discourse can be looked at with the analytic concept of interpretive repertoire (Wetherell and Potter, 1992), by examining various textual materials as to how the writer/speaker/narrator claims the position of reconciliation. In so doing, we may be able to reveal the intimately inter-linked nature of history and its personal significance. This inter-linked nature of collective and personal significance was advocated in terms of interdependencies of public and privately relevant past in this study. Let me emphasise that I am not downplaying the discursive approach I took in this thesis. On the contrary, I wish to emphasise that by examining the historical change of discourse and identifying a repertoire situated in particular time and space, we may be able to understand the socially constituted process of identity (self, or personhood) at a 'macro' level. In other words, we can address the issues of how the individual begins to subscribe to and incorporate a view of self and identity that is socially constructed and how (and maybe when) such a shift or change happens. One of the major tasks is to track down historical changes in terms of a repertoire of narratives and to examine how people claim reconciliation, redemption and forgiveness and how these claims are substantiated and made accountable for a particular concern of the society or linguistic community at large. This would give rise to and give more currency to the issues that were addressed in Chapter one, autobiographical memory, life review, collective memory, ideological dilemma, collective sense-making and story telling, apology and forgiveness, as well as the issue of reconciliation and its relation to discursive ontology (or identity, self, and personae).

The discursive turn combined with a diachronic study of the historical impact to construction of, and development of identity, and accountability of the past might be able to address the socially and historically emergent nature of social practices of reconciliation. What we call reconciliation experts began their activities of reconciliation not because of the mentalistic model and the idealised and philosophised version of reconciliation. The reconciliatory activities are triggered and motivated by the presence of, and discovery of physical objects and materials, such as

elected memorials, graves, and letters, diaries and novels. In a broad sense of the term "material", my initial experience of seeing the image of angry former POWs on the front page of the newspaper has a material basis for people to engage themselves in social practices of reconciliation, in which a particular past is at issue and its status becomes highly controversial and consequential to the present and the future. The materiality of memory has been studied in a number of ways in various disciplines (e.g., Brockmeier, in press; Buruma, 1994; Sondage, 1993; Young, 1989; 1993). Instead of asking a chicken-and-egg kind of question of whether material objects represent the past and how they influence the materiality of monuments and commemorative activities such as anniversaries, we may approach this issue in terms of interdependency of virtual vs. material (object/non-discursive and non-object/discursive) (Brown, Middleton et al., 2001). Applying this concept to the present study, we can examine the notion, Iruka as a place where the past resides, as this phrase was repeatedly invoked by the British participants as well as by the Japanese cohort. Particularly relevant to the current study would be to ask how the grave in Japan is constituted as a material basis for memory and people's act of remembering. In some circumstances the categories of discursive and non-discursive would blur and present an interesting phenomenon and material for future study.

Discourse of reconciliation practices

This research was undertaken to examine communicative activities of reconciliation in the form of psychological research between the researcher and the former ex-POW participants. In the recent years, as we noted in the earlier chapter, our concern over reconciliation between nations, communities, families and people with differences in ethnic, cultural, linguistic, religious and ideological orientations has been identified as not only local phenomena but also global phenomena. Especially we live in the new millennium of a new world order, marked by emergence of new way of doing business (e.g., e-commerce), economic infrastructure, new technology and scientific knowledge, and ideological shift. Discourse of potential, impending and actual conflicts are part of our everyday lives, as we hear about the attacks and riots at our prime time news everyday. We are, knowingly and unknowingly involved in, and implicated in conflicts and crisis and threat to peace and stability in our everyday use of technology, namely electronic and virtual media, computers, internet, etc. The news about upheavals, turmoil and violence compels our immediate social actions,

and consequently people are engaged in social practices of reconciliation. For instance, political, religious, tribal and community leaders incessantly assert the primary importance of reconciliation, especially with the recent advent of international crises and resurgence of ethnic and religious conflicts in the world.[1] We can easily think of the recent event of demolition of the twin towers of World Trade Center in New York City as it is very fresh in our mind when it comes to an example of religiously and ethnically induced global conflict. With such outcries for need for reconciliation, various initiatives have been taken to respond to it and organise and lead programs and activities for those who suffered from conflicts and their consequences. My research is realised in the form of PhD research project as one example of a reaction to the social phenomena.

In the course of the research, I have met many so-called "reconciliation experts." I don't think this is an established career track, nor widely acknowledged job title. Many of them are self-proclaimed reconciliation practitioners, who organise and lead the activities for those who claim to have suffered from the previous wrongdoing by others. These reconciliation practitioners and experts come from various backgrounds in different orientations to motivations, purposes, and expectations and underlying philosophy of reconciliation practices. Some of them are the former sufferers, who have lived through a troubling past as being part of the war effort or other conflicts. Many started from a grass-root level, talking about their own troubling past to others. They often had discovered the unknown past by accident and subsequently acted on their moral impetus. Through contacts, mainly talking to others and writing stories for others to read, they formed organisations and even became affiliated to a larger organisation (e.g., veterans' organisation, non-profit, religious and government organisations). The current study would take its new shape in furthering and developing the analysis of discursive practices of those reconciliation experts. The implications of the analysis presented in the thesis is that reconciliation practices should be subjected to a critical gaze of the discursive psychologist and the like. The study would not only produce elaborated empirical evidence from the discourse approach to reconciliation, but also would address broader social issues. Identity and accountability would be core theoretical themes in exploring further the issues of social remembering and social organisation of the past. Further study would

---

[1] While undertaking this research from1998 to 2001, many crisis and conflicts occurred in various parts of the world (e.g., Rewanda, Bosnia, Kosovo, and Afghanistan).

allow for unpacking some of the practitioner's claims of healing and restoration of personhood by examining situated identities in the discourse of accountability. We could critically examine the pre-existing clinical psychological practices and caregiving practices to those sufferers and unravel the practitioners,' and caregivers,' understanding and the underlying reasoning of their reconciliation practices. These practices are often premised on the cognitive, experimental model and view of reconciliation. Further work would inform psychology of all disciplines in making contribution to understanding of relations between human cognition and society and re-emphasises the importance of examining discursive activities in situated practices.

REFERENCES

Abado, A. (1990). The speech act of apology in political life. *Journal of pragmatics, 14*, 467-487.

Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism.* London: Verso. (Revised edition).

Ashmore, M. and D. Reed (2000, December). Innocence and nostalgia in conversation analysis: The dynamic relations of tape and transcript [45 paragraphs]. *Forum: Qualitative social research [On-line journal] 1(3), 1* (3), http://qualitative-research.net/fqs/fqs-eng.htm.

Asmal, K., L. Asmal, et al. (1997). *Reconciliation through truth: A reckoning of apartheid's criminal governance.* Cape Town: David Philip Publishers. (Second Edition).

Assmann, J. (1999). Communicating history and representing the past in the ancient near East, Hanover University, Germany, 23-25 September

Atkinson, J. M. and J. Heritage, Eds. (1984). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Austin, J. L. (1975(1962)). *How to do things with words.* Oxford: Clarendon Press. (2nd).

Bamberg, M. G. (1997). Positioning between structure and performance. *Journal of narrative and life history, 7* (1-4), 335-342.

Barclay, C. R. (1994). Collective remembering. *Semiotica, 101* (3/4), 323-330.

Bartlett, F. C. (1932/1995). *Remembering: A study in experimental and social psychology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Benjamin, W. (1970). *Illuminations (edited and with an introduction by Hannah Arendt).* London: Jonathan Cape.

Bergmann, J. R. (1990). On the local sensitivity of conversation. In I. Markovà and K. Foppa (Eds.), *The dynamics of dialogue* (pp. 201-226). Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Billig, M. (1989). The argumentative nature of holding strong views: A case study. *European journal of social psychology, 19*, 203-223.

Billig, M. (1990). Collective memory, ideology and the British royal family. In D. J. Middleton and D. Edwards (Eds.), *Collective remembering* (pp. 60-80). London: Sage.

Billig, M. (1991). *Ideology and opinions: Studies in rhetorical psychology.* London: Sage.

Billig, M. (1995). *Banal nationalism.* London: Sage.

Billig, M. (1996). *Arguing and thinking: A rhetorical approach to social psychology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (2nd edition).

Billig, M. (1999). *Freudian repression: conversation creating the unconscious.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Billig, M., S. Condor, et al. (1988). *Ideological dilemmas: A social psychology of everyday thinking.* London: Sage Publications.

Boden, D. D. V. B., Denise (1983). The past as resource: A conversational analysis of elderly talk. *Human Development, 26*, 308-319.

Braun, V. (1999). Breaking taboo? Talking (and laughing) about the vagina. *Feminism & psychology, 9* (3), 367-372.

Brecke, P. and W. J. Long (1999). War and reconciliation. *International interactions, 25* (2), 95-117.

Brockmeier, J. (in press). Remembering and forgetting: Narrative as cultural memory. *Culture & psychology*, .

Bromley, R. (1988). *Lost narratives: Popular fictions and recent history.* London: Routledge.

Brown, S. D., D. Middleton, et al. (2001). Performing the past in electronic archives: Interdependencies in the discursive and non-discursive ordering of institutional rememberings. *Culture & psychology, 7* (2), 123-144.

Bruner, J. S. (1990a). *Acts of meaning.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bruner, J. S. (1990b). Life as narrative. *Social research, 54*, 11-32.

Buchanan, K. and D. Middleton (1994). Reminiscence reviewed: A discourse analytic perspective. In J. Bornat (Ed.), *Reminiscence reviewed: Evaluations, achievements, perspectives* (pp. 61-73). Buckingham: Open University Press.

Buchanan, K. and D. Middleton (1995). Voices of Experience: Talk, identity and membership in Reminiscence groups. *Aging and society, 15* , 457-491.

Buchanan, K. and D. J. Middleton (1993). Discursively formulating the significance of reminiscence in later life. In N. Coupland and J. F. Nussbaum (Eds.), *Discourse and lifespan identity.* (4, pp. 55-80). Newbury Park: Sage.

Buruma, I. (1994). *Wages of guilt: Memories of war in Germany and Japan.* London: Jonathan Cape.

Butler, R. N. (1963). The life review: An interpretation of reminiscence in the aged. *Psychiatry, 26* (65-76), 281-294.

Buttny, R. (1993). *Social accountability in communication.* London: Sage.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of a theory of syntax.* The Hague: Mouton.

Chomsky, N. (1966). *Cartesian linguistics: A chapter in the history of rationalist thought.* New York: Harper and Row.

Clayman, S. E. (1992). Footing in the achievement of neutrality: the case of news-interview discourse. In P. Drew and J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings* (pp. 163-198). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cole, M. (1988). Cross-cultural research in the sociohistorical tradition. *Human development, 31* , 137-57.

Coleman, P. G. (1974). Measuring reminiscence characteristics from conversation as adaptive features of old age. *International journal of ageing and human development, 5* , 281-294.

Coleman, P. G. (1999). Creating a life story: The task of reconciliation. *The gerontologist, 39* (2), 133-139.

Cook, H. T. and T. F. Cook (1992). *Japan at war: an oral history.* New York: The New Press.

Coser, R. L. (1959). Some social functions of laughter. *Human relations, 12* , 171-182.

Coulter, J. (1985). Two concepts of the mental. In K. J. Gergen and K. E. Davis. (Eds.), *The social construction of the person.* New York: Springer-Verlag.

Davies, B. and R. Harré (1990). Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the theory of social behavior, 20* , 43-63.

Davis, N. Z. and R. Starn (1989). Memory and Counter-Memory. *Special Issue of Representations, 26* (Spring), .

Day, D. (1994). Tang's dilemma and other problems: Ethnification processes at some multicultural workplaces. *Pragmatics, 4* , 315-336.

Day, D. (1998). Being ascribed, and resisting, membership of an ethnic group. In C. Antaki and S. Widdicombe (Eds.), *Identities in talk* (pp. 151-190). London: Sage.

Douglas, M. (1980). *Evans-Prichard*: Fontana Paperbacks.

Douglas, M. (1987(1986)). *How institutions think.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. (Originally published in 1986 by Syracuse University Press).

Drew, P. (1991). Asymmetries of knowledge in conversational interactions. In I. Markovà and K. Foppa (Eds.), *Asymmetries of dialogue* (pp. 21-48). Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Drew, P. (1998). Complaints about transgressions and misconduct. *Research on language and social interaction, 31* (3&4), 295-325.

Drew, P. and J. Heritage, Eds. (1992). *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Durkheim, E. (1893/1984). *The division of labour in society.* London: MacMillan.

Durkheim, E. (1895/1982). *The rules of sociological method.* London: MacMillan Press.

Durnati, A. and C. Goodwin, Eds. (1992). *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Edwards, D. (1995). A commentary on discursive and cultural psychology. *Culture & psychology, 1* (1), 55-65.

Edwards, D. (1997). *Discourse and cognition.* London: Sage.

Edwards, D., M. Ashmore, et al. (1995). Death and furniture: The rhetoric, politics and theology of bottom line arguments against relativism. *History of the human sciences, 8* (No. 2), 25-49.

Edwards, D. and D. J. Middleton (1986). Joint remembering: Constructing an account of shared experience through conversational discourse. *Discourse processes, 9* , 423-459.

Edwards, D. and J. Potter (1992). *Discursive psychology.* London: Sage.

Edwards, D., J. Potter, et al. (1992). Toward a discursive psychology of remembering. *The psychologist* , 441-455.

Ehrenhaus, P. (1989). Commemorating the Unwon War: On *not* remembering Vietnam. *Journal of Communication, 39* (1), 96-107.

Embassy-of-Japan (2000). Working for reconciliation. [On-line]. Available: http://www.embjapan.org.uk/japan/archive/article_670.html#3.

Evans-Prichard, E. E. (1937/1950). *Witchcraft, oracles and magic among the Azande.* London: Oxford University Press.

FitzGerald, F. (1979). *America revisited: History schoolbooks in the twentieth century.* New York: Vintage.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Garfinkel, H. (1974). The Origins of the Term 'Ethnomethodology'. In R. Turner (Ed.), *Ethnomethodology* (pp. 15-40). Middlesex, England: Penguin Education.

Gergen, K. J. (1997). Social psychology as social construction: The Emerging Vision. In C. McGarty and A. S. Haslam (Eds.), *The Message of Social Psychology: ' Perspectives on Mind in Society* (pp. 113-128). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Glenn, P. J. (1989). Initiating shared laughter in multi-party conversations. *Western journal of speech communication, 53* (Spring), 127-149.

Glenn, P. J. (1991/1992). Current speaker initiation of two-party shared laughter. *Research on language and social interaction, 25* , 139-162.

Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Goffman, E. (1983). The interactional order. *American sociological review, 48* (February), 1-17.

Goodwin, C. (1987). Forgetfulness as an interactive resource. *Social psychology quarterly, 50* (2), 115-131.

Goodwin, C. (2000). Action and embodiment within situated human interaction. *Journal of pragmatics, 32* , 1489-1522.

Goodwin, C. and A. Duranti (1992). Rethinking context: An introduction. In C. Goodwin and A. Duranti (Eds.), *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon* (pp. 1-42). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Green, R. H. and I. I. Ahmed (1999). Rehabilitation, sustainable peace and development: Towards reconceptualisation. *Third world quarterly, 20* (1), 189-206.

Gupta, S. (1996). *Memory and the role of remembering in on-going thought process.* II International Conference on Sociocultural Research, Geneva.

Halbwachs, M. (1925/1952). *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire.* Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Halbwachs, M. (1951/1980). *The Collective Memory.* New York: Harper & Row.

Hammersley, M. (1992). *What's Wrong with ethnography: Methodological explorations.* London: Routledge.

Harré, R. and G. Gillet (1994). *The discursive mind.* Thousand Oaks, USA: Sage.

Harré, R. and L. Van Langenhove (1991). Varieties of positioning. *Journal for the theory of social behaviour, 21* (4), 393-407.

Heath, C. (1997). The analysis of activities in face to face interaction using video. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice* (pp. 183-200). London: Sage.

Hepburn, A. and S. D. Brown (2001). Teacher stress and the management of accountability. *Human Relations, 54* (6), 691-715.

Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Holmes, J. (1992). *Introduction to sociolinguistics.* Harlow, Essex: Longman.

Holstein, J. A. and J. F. Gubrium (1997). Active interviewing. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice* (pp. 113-129). London: Sage.

Holt, E. (1996). Reporting on talk: Direct reported speech in conversation. *Research on language and social interaction, 29* (3), 219-245.

Hutchby, I. (1997). Building alignments in public debate. *Text, 17* (12), 161-179.

Ide, R. (1998). 'Sorry for your kindness': Japanese interactional ritual in public discourse. *Journal of pragmatics, 29* , 509-529.

Janet, P. (1928). *L'Évolution de la mémoire et de la notion du temps.* Paris: A. Chahine.

Jefferson, G. (1984). On the organization of laughter in talk about troubles. In J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 167-190). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jefferson, G. (1988). On the sequential organization of troubles-talk in ordinary conversation. *Social problems, 35* (4), 418-441.

Jefferson, G., H. Sacks, et al. (1987). Notes on laughter in the pursuit of intimacy. In G. Button and J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organisation* (pp. 152-205). Cleveland, Ohio: Multilingual Matters Limited.

Johnson, R., G. McLennan, et al. (1982). *Making histories: Studies in history-writing and politics.* London: Hutchinson in association with the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, University of Birmingham.

Kirk, J. and M. L. Miller (1986). *Reliability and validity in qualitative research.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Krondorfer, B. (1995). *Remembrance and reconciliation: Encounters between young Jews and Germans.* New Heaven: Yale University Press.

Kundera, M. (1983). *The book of laughter and forgetting.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Le Goff, J. (1992). *History and memory.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Letters (1998). Letters to the editor. *The Independent.*

Linell, P. and T. Luckmann (1991). Asymmetries in dialogue: Some conceptual preliminaries. In I. Markovà and K. Foppa (Eds.), *Asymmetries in dialogue* (pp. 1-20). Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Loentiev, A. N. (1981). *Problems of development of the mind.* Moscow: Progress House.

Lowenthal, D. (1985). *The past is a foreign country.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lupton, D. (1996). *Food, the body and the self.* London: Sage.

Luria, A. (1968). *The mind of a mnemonist.* New York: Basic Books.

Lynch, M. and D. Bogen (1996). *The spectacle of history: Speech, text, and memory at the Iran-contra hearings.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

MacMillan, K. and D. Edwards (1998). 'Designer families': A discourse study of fact and accountability. *Journal of sociolinguistics, 2* (3), 323-345.

Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self and society from the standpoint of a social behaviourist.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mercer, N. (2000). *Words and minds: How we use language to think together by Neil Mercer.* London: Routledge.

Middleton, D. (1996). A discursive analysis of psychological issues: Talk in a 'parent group' for families who have children with chronic renal failure. *Psychology and Health, 11 ,* 243-260.

Middleton, D. (1997a). Conversational remembering and uncertainty: Interdependencies of experience as individual and collective concerns in teamwork. *Journal of language and social psychology, 16* (4), 389-410.

Middleton, D. (1997b). The social organization of conversational remembering: Experience as individual and collective concerns. *Mind, culture, and activity, 4* (2), 71-85.

Middleton, D. and K. Buchanan (1991). Reminiscence: Some rhetorical resources in remembering collectively. *Activity theory* (9/10), 12-19.

Middleton, D. and K. Buchanan (1993). Is reminiscence working?: Accountability for the therapeutic benefits of reminiscence work with older people. *Journal of aging studies, 7* (Number 3), 321-333.

Middleton, D. and D. Edwards, Eds. (1990). *Collective remembering.* Inquiries in social construction. London: Sage.

Middleton, D. and H. Hewitt (1999). Remembering as social practice: Identity and life story work in transitions of care for people with profound learning disabilities. *Narrative Enquiry, 9* (1), 1-25.

Moerman, M. (1973). *Talking culture: Ethnography and conversation analysis.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Moerman, M. (1974). Accomplishing ethnicity. In R. Turner (Ed.), *Ethnomothodology: Selected readings* (pp. 54-68). Harmondsworth: Penguin Education.

Mulkay, M. (1979). *Science and the sociology of knowledge.* London: George Allen & Unwin.

Mulkay, M. (1985). Agreement and disagreement in conversations and letters. *Text, 5* (3), 201-227.

Murata, K. (1998). Has he apologized or not?: A cross-cultural misunderstanding between the UK and Japan on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of VJ day in Britain. *Pragmatics, 8* (4), 501-513.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1997). Code-switching. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *The handbook of sociolinguistics* (pp. 217-237). Oxford: Blackwell.

Nakao, T. (2000). Horyo wa naze wakai ni unazuke nai ka: Eikoku horyo yokuryusha mondai ni okeru sogo no koozu (why the prisoners of war cannot approve of reconciliation: The plot of discrepancy regarding the problem of the British POWs and internees). *Gendai shisoo, 28* (13), 145-169.

Neisser, U. (1982). John Dean's memory: A case study. In U. Neisser (Ed.), *Memory observed: Remembering in natural contexts* (pp. 139-159). New York: W. H. Freeman and company.

Neisser, U. and E. Winograd (1988). *Remembering reconsidered: Ecological and traditional approaches to the study of memory.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Norval, A., J. (1998). Memory, Identity and the (Im)possibility of reconciliation: The Work of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in South Africa. *Constellations, 5* (2), .

Nosfinger, R. E. (1991). *Everyday conversation.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Obeng, S. G. (1999). Apologies in Akan discourse. *Journal of pragmatics, 31* , 709-734.

OED (1996). *The Oxford English Reference Dictionary.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. (2nd).

Ohnuki-Tierney, E. (1993). *Rice as self: Japanese identities through time.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Orr, J. E. (1990). Sharing knowledge, celebrating identity: Community memory in a service culture. In D. J. Middleton and D. Edwards (Eds.), *Collective remembering* (pp. 167-189). London: Sage,.

Padden, C. A. (1990). Folk explanation in language survival. In D. J. Middleton and D. Edwards (Eds.), *Collective remembering* (pp. 190-202). London: Sage.

Peräkylä, A. (1997). Reliability and validity in research based on tapes and transcripts. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice* (pp. 201-220). London: Sage.

Pierce, C. S. (1894). What is a sign? [On-line]. Available:
        http://www.iupui.edu/%7Eperice/web/ep/ep2/ep2book/ch02/ch02.htm.

Pizzini, F. (1991). Communication hierarchies in humour: gender differences in the
        obstetrical/gynaecological setting. *Discourse & society, 2* (4), 477-488.

Pomerantz, A. (1986). Extreme Case formulations: A way of legitimizing claims. *Human
        Studies, 9* , 219-229.

Potter, J. (1996). *Representing reality.* London: Sage.

Potter, J. (1998). Cognition as context (Whose cognition?). *Research on language and
        social interaction, 3* (1), 29-44.

Potter, J. and M. Wetherell (1987). *Discourse and social psychology: beyond attitudes
        and behaviour.* London: Sage Publications.

Retzinger, S. (1992). Mea culpa: A sociology of apology and reconciliation (book
        review). *American journal of sociology, 97* (6), 1754-1756.

Retzinger, S. M. (1991). *Violent emotions: shame and rage in marital quarrels.* Newbury
        Park: Sage Publications.

Rowe, S., T. Kosyaeva, et al. (In press). Linking little narratives to big ones: Narrative
        and public memory in history museums. *Culture & psychology* , XX-XX.

Sabat, S. R. and R. Harré (1992). The construction and deconstruction of self in
        Alzheimer's disease. *Ageing and society, 12* , 443-461.

Sacks, H. (1974). On the analysability of stories by children. In R. Turner (Ed.),
        Ethnomethodology: Selected readings (pp. 216-232). Penguin Education.

Sacks, H. (1992a). April 24: Second stories. In G. Jefferson (Ed.), *Lectures on
        conversation (edited by Gail Jefferson; introduction by Emanuel A Schegloff)* (pp.
        764-772 (Part VII)). Oxford: Blackwell.

Sacks, H. (1992b/1995). *Lectures on conversation (edited by Gail Jefferson; introduction
        by Emanuel A Schegloff).* Oxford: Blackwell.

Sacks, H. (1992c). Lecture I: Second stories; "Mm hm;" Story prefaces; 'Local news;'
        Tellability. In G. Jefferson (Ed.), *Lectures on conversation (edited by Gail
        Jefferson; introduction by Emanuel A Schegloff)* (pp. 3-16 (Part I)). Oxford:
        Blackwell.

Sacks, H. (1992d) Lecture 4: Storyteller as 'witness;' Entitlement to experience. In G. Jefferson (Ed.), *Lectures on conversation (edited by Gail Jefferson; introduction by Emanuel A Schegloff)* (pp. 242-248). Oxford: Blackwell.

Schegloff, E. A. (1984). In another context. In J. Heritage and J. M. Atkinson (Ed.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 193-227). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1997). Whose text? Whose context? *Discourse & Society, 8* (2), 165-187.

Schelesinger, A. M. J. (1992). *The disuniting of America: Reflections on a multicultural society*. New York: Norton.

Schrager, S. (1983). What is social in oral history? *International journal of oral history, 4* (June), 76-98.

Schudson, M. (1990). Ronald Reagan misremembered. In D. Middleton and D. Edwards (Eds.), *Collective remembering* (pp. 108-119). London: Sage.

Schuman, H., H. Akiyama, et al. (1998). Collective memories of Germans and Japanese about the past half-century. *Memory, 6* (4), 427-454.

Schuman, H. and J. Scott (1989). Generations and collective memories. *American Sociological Review, 54* (June), 359-381.

Schwartz, B. (1990). The reconstruction of Abraham Lincoln. In D. Middleton and D. Edwards (Eds.), *Collective remembering* (pp. 81-107). London: Sage.

Schwartz, B. (1996). Memory as a cultural system: Abraham Lincoln in World War II. *American Sociological Review, 61* (5), 908-927.

Schwartz, B. (1999). Memory and the practices of commitment. In B. Glassner and R. Hertz (Eds.), *Qualitative sociology as everyday life* (pp. 135-146). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schwartz, B., Y. Zerubavel, et al. (1982). The social context of commemoration: A study in collective memory. *Social forces, 61* , 374-402.

Scott, J. and L. Sac (1993). Collective memories in Britain and the United States. *Public opinion quarterly, 57* , 315-331.

Shotter, J. (1990). The social construction of remembering and forgetting. In D. J. Middleton and D. Edwards (Eds.), *Collective remembering* (pp. 120-138). London: Sage.

Shotter, J. (1991). The social construction of remembering: A rhetorical-responsive account. *Activity theory, 9* (10), 26-31.

Shotter, J. (1993). Becoming someone: Identity and belonging. In N. Coupland and J. F. Nussbaum (Eds.), *Discourse and lifespan identity* (pp. 5-27). Newbury Park: Sage.

Silverman, D. (1993). *Interpreting qualitative data: Methods for analysing talk, text and interaction.* London: Sage.

Silverman, D., Ed. (1997). *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice.* London: Sage.

Sondage, S. A. (1993). A marble house divided: The Lincoln memorial, the civil rights movement, and the politics of memory. *Journal of American history, 80* (1), 135-167.

Sturken, M. (1991). The wall, the screen, and the image: The Vietnam veterans memorial. *Representations, 35* (Summer), 118-142.

Sturken, M. (1997). *Tangled memories: The Vietnam War, the aids epidemic, and the politics of remembering.* London: University of California Press.

Swartz, L. and G. Drennan (2000). The cultural construction of healing in the Truth and Reconciliation Commission: implications for mental health practice. *Ethnicity & Health, 5* (3/4), 205-213.

Takaku, S. (2000). Culture and status as influences on account giving: A comparison between the United States and Japan. *Journal of applied social psychology, 30* (2), 371-388.

Takaku, S., B. Weiner, et al. (2001). A cross-cultural examination of the effects of apology and perspective taking on forgiveness. *Journal of language and social psychology, 20* (1&2. March/June), 144-166.

Tavuchis, N. (1991). *Mea Culpa: Sociology of apology and reconciliation.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Taylor, S. and M. Wetherell (1999). A suitable time and place: Speakers' use of 'time' to do discursive work in narratives of nation and personal life. *Time & society, 8* (1), 39-58.

Trosborg, A. (1987). Apology strategies in natives/non-natives. *Journal of pragmatics, 11* , 147-167.

Tutu, D. (1999). *No future without forgiveness.* London: Rider.

Valsiner, J. (1994). Co-construction: what is (and is not) in a name. In P. van Geert and L. Mos (Eds.), *Annals of theoretical psychology (Vol. 10)*. New York: Plenum.

van der Veer, R. and J. Valsiner (1991). *Understanding Vygotsky: A quest for synthesis*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Van Langenhove, L. and R. Harré (1993). Positioning and autobiography: Telling your life. In N. Coupland and J. F. Nussbaum (Eds.), *Discourse and lifespan identity* (pp. 81-99). Newbury Park: Sage.

Vangelisti, A. L. (1992). My Fault or Yours? (Book review). *Contemporary psychology, 37* (12), 1314.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1929). The problem of the cultural development of the child. *Journal of genetic psychology, 36* , 415-434.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1987). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Wertsch, J. V. (1985). *Vygotsky and the social formation of mind*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wertsch, J. V. (1987). Collective memory: Issues from a socio-historical perspective. *Quarterly Newsletter of the Laboratory of Comparative Human Cognition, 9* (1), 19-22.

Wertsch, J. V. (1997). Narrative tools of history and identity. *Culture & psychology, 3* (1), 5-20.

Wertsch, J. V. (1998). *Mind as action*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wetherell, M. (1998). Positioning and interpretative repertoires: conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue. *Discourse & society, 9* (3), 387-412.

Wetherell, M. and J. Potter (1992). *Mapping the language of racism: Discourse and the legitimation of exploitation*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

White, G. M. (1997). Mythic history and national memory: The Pearl Harbor anniversary. *Culture & psychology, 3* (1), 63-88.

Wittgenstein, L. (1968 (1958)). *Philosophical investigations*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Wooffitt, R. (1992). *Telling tales of the unexpected: The organisation of factual discourse*. Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Young, J. E. (1989). The biography of a memorial icon: Nathan Rapoport's Warsaw Ghetto monument. *Representations, 26* (Spring), 69-106.

Young, J. E. (1993). *Texture of memory: Holocaust memorials and meaning.* New Heaven: Yale University Press.

Zelizer, B. (1995). Reading the past against the grain: The shape of memory studies. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication, 12* , 214-239.

Zerubavel, E. (1996). Social memories: Steps to sociology of the past. *Qualitative sociology, 19* (3), 283-299.

APPENDIX 1

Transcription notation

The transcription convention used in the thesis has been developed by Gail Jefferson for the purposes of conversation analysis (see Atkinson and Heritage, 1984).

[　　]	Speech overlap
[	Overlap begins
↑↓	Vertical arrows precede marked pitch movement, over and above normal rhythm of speech.
→	Side arrows are not transcription features, but draw analytic attention to particular lines of text. Usually positioned to the left of the line.
Under<u>lining</u>	Signals vocal emphasis
CAPITALS	Mark speech that is obviously louder than surrounding speech (often occurs when speakers are hearably competing for the floor, raised volume rather than doing contrastive emphasis.)
°I know it,°	'degree' signs enclose obviously quieter speech
(　　)	Inaudible, indecipherable utterance, uncertain hearing
(0.4)	Pause (in seconds and/or tenths of a second)
(.)	A micropause, hearable but too short to measure.
((text))	Additional comments from the transcriber, e.g., gesture, context or intonation comments by the transcriber
she wa::nted	Prolonged syllable or sound stretch
hhh	Audible aspiration or laughter
.hhh	Audible inhalation
Yeh,	'Continuation' marker, speaker has not finished; marked by fall-rise or weak rising intonation, as when enunciating lists.
y'know?	Question marks signal stronger, 'questioning' intonation, irrespective of grammar.
Yeh.	Periods (full stops) mark falling, stopping intonation ('final contour'), irrespective of grammar, and not necessarily followed by a pause.
bu-u-	Hyphens mark a cut-off of the preceding sound
>he said<	'greater than' and 'lesser than' signs enclose speeded-up talk.
<he said>	The other way round of the sings enclose slower talk.
solid.= =We said	Latched utterance (no interval between them)
Sto(h)p i(h)t.	Laughter within speech is signalled by h's in parentheses., Audible aspiration within a word
heh heh	Voiced laughter. Alternatively, some laughters of Japanese speakers were transcribed as haha, hehehe.
uh um	Filler between words. Alternatively 'er,' 'erm', and 'ah' 'ehh' are used.

In addition to the above, the following is added:

Oi koi	Italicised words are of Japanese origin.

APPENDIX 2: Letters page

Independent, 28 May 1998

LETTERS

Emperor and PoWs

Sir: I was appalled by the discourtesy to the Queen and her guest, Emperor Akihito of Japan. Arthur Titherington, chairman of the Japanese Labour Camps Survivors' Association, who has been given almost unlimited coverage to express his opinions, does not speak for all Far East prisoners of war.

I also worked on the Thai-Burma railway, at Sonkurai, where 1,200 out of 1,600 were dead within three months. I agreed to take part in an escape attempt to let the outside world know how prisoners worked and died. I am now the only survivor of any such attempt from Thailand. Five died on our escape. After being taken for execution, but saved by the intervention of Colonel Cyril Wild, I was sentenced to eight years' penal servitude in Outram Road jail.

I still have nightmares, but these are not caused by the present or immediate past generation of Japanese. We have reached a time, finally, to forgive, even though it is impossible to forget. The future is all-important.
JAMES BRADLEY
Winchester

Sir: As a Japanese national who has lived in Britain for over 17 years I was surprised by Tony Blair's statement regarding the PoW problem. It is sad that economic necessity has overruled the suffering that the PoWs and internees experienced. However, it is equally sad that the British right-wing media has hijacked the PoW issue and used it as a stick to beat Japan.

Neither country can take the moral high ground: Japan because of the atrocities committed by its soldiers during and before the Second World War, and Britain because of its poor record in Ireland, India and China during the years of the British Empire.

The real crime in this affair is the crime of nationalism. Japan was a poor country at the beginning of the 20th century and was desperate to catch up with Western nations. It utilised nationalism and imperialism as tools to achieve industrialisation.

a process which brutalised the common Japanese worker, who was forced to work extremely hard for minimum reward and in the harshest of conditions. The Emperor was used as an icon to concentrate the spiritual energy of the nation, to justify the hardship and also the plundering of other nations. The pathological atrocities perpetrated by the Japanese soldiers illustrate the intensity of this totalitarian regime, under which the Japanese people also suffered.

Why not call it quits and forget it? Because those who forget the past are condemned to repeat it. The way forward for Japan is to start teaching the young people in school exactly what went on during the war. They are being extremely complacent by not doing so. We cannot turn a new leaf without coming to terms with the past.
TOKUKO HASHIMOTO
Editor
Eikoku News Digest
London E2

Sir: As a war veteran myself, one of whose school chums was tortured and beheaded by his Japanese captors for the "crime" of attempting to defend his country against a ruthless invading army described by Sir Donald Maitland (letter, 25 May) as "brave and skilful" (a plaudit equally applicable to the Nazi SS), I have a confession to make.

I don't hate the Japanese, some 80 per cent of whom were either born after the war, or too late to take any part in it. But I have little time either for those who concealed their bestial war record for so long from their own children, and who think that saying "sorry" somehow heals the shattered lives and bodies of our miserably recompensed heroes who stood against them, and whom we now treat so shamefully.
LEN CLARKE
Uxbridge, Middlesex

Sir: I travelled from Australia specifically to attend the protest against the Japanese Emperor. My uncle died in a PoW camp in 1943. According to his pals who survived he was treated inhumanly. As I am his closest living relative I feel duty-bound to represent what I believe he would do were he able. I am not driven by a desire for "blood-money". A simply apology would suffice.
JOE O'BRIEN
Milnrow,
Greater Manchester

Sir: I have every sympathy for the experiences endured by the former PoWs. However, the Japanese government has already apologised, which Emperor Akihito cannot do because of his constitutional position. During the Queen's visit to Punjab last year, no apology was made for the Amritsar massacre.
BALRAJ SINGH GILL
Slough,
Berkshire

Sir: The vast majority of people in Japan today were not even born until after the atrocities. If we are to hold people responsible for their ancestors' crimes, then we, the British people, will spend the best part of the rest of our lives apologising. I don't accept responsibility for the slave trade or any of the countless crimes committed by British citizens under the banner of imperialism.
CHRISTOPHER WRIGHT
Reading, Berkshire

Sir: As a student of uniform, I tend to clip all pictures of people wearing them for my files. But today (27 May) I do not intend to keep your front page picture, as I do not wish to embarrass members of the Royal Corps of Signals by preserving an image of the display of shocking bad manners by one of their number.
MEGAN C ROBERTSON
Crewe, Cheshire

Appendix 3: Extracts in full sequence

Chapter 5: *Extracts on the language of the past*

Extract 1-1: Who's in charge--*Kyootsukeeh*

```
 1  Ted:      I haven't worked all morning getting it right
 2            For you just to look at it
 3  Audrey:   Well- well I usually eat first and then
 4            [I (         )
 5  Ted:      [(right) right. (Now) what would you like to
 6            Hear about (.)would you like to hear how
 7  Int.:     Yes, uhm (.) are you finished with all-
 8  Ted:      Aye we're all right (.) [we're all right
 9  Mary:                             [yes yes
10  Ted:                                  [I am all right.
11            You are in charge now.
12  Int.:     Oh, no. hohoho.
13  Ted:      You give the orders. Kyo:tuske:h¹.
14  Int.:     Hh no, no, no, no. I'm not here for that.
15            Hehh. Um ((drink))
16  Ted:      (Now hurry up when) Charlie's out and then
17            You might get some (.) order.
18            Heh he[h
19  Mary:           [heh heh heh
20  Int.:     Well (.) is this a comfortable (.) seating
21            [arrangement for everyone?
22  Ted:      [get yourself comfortable
23  Ray:      Oh we're lovely and comfortable.
24  Charlie:  Are you finished with this plate, honey?
25  Int.:     Yeah. Thank you.
25  Charlie:  Okay, now.
27  Int.:     I'll get my notebook then.
```

Extract 1-2: Japanese wizardry

```
28  Ted:      She's gonna start recording (I think).
29  Charlie:  Any more plates, anywhere. ((some noises))
30            No right carry on then (.) any more tea in
31            there (.) aye there is (.) I'll have another
32            Cup
33  (.)
34  Ted:      Are you gonna get the electronic recording,
35            (these (.) well) electronic wizards these
36            Japanese. Oh (.) do you know that bit where I
37            talk about when we went into the- (.) we put
38            wor hands under [the tap (.)
39  Ray:                      [mm yeah
40  ((clap))
41  Sidney:   Yeah
42  Ted:      stops and starts
43  Sidney:   Yeah
44  Ted:      hhh well I was at Fennicks about a couple of
45            year ago °I dounno whether it might have been°
46            on the toy floor and the restaurant I went in
47            and- [when I came out=
48  Mary:          [(         ) around there
49  Ted       =when I came out there was a bloke trying to
50            wash his hands you know (.) he was gannin'
```

---

¹ English equivalent of this Japanese phrase is "Stand to attention!"

```
51                "where's the (.) tap" "oh" I says, "allow me
52                to show you" (.) put your hands under shhh
53                take them away (.) I says
54  Mary?:        (put- put them in)
55  Ted:          I says I learnt that in a Japanese bus
56                two years ago
57  Ray:          Well uh I tell where they've got them uhmmm
58                (.) you know when we went to Norway
59  Ted:          aye
60  Ray:          we got them in (where you got on the boˆat)
61  Ted:          Did they (.) [aye
62  ?:                         [aye
63  Charlie:      they've got them (          Norway)
64  Ray:          Aye
65  Ted:          Aye they got them in Fennicks, aye (.)
66                on the-
67  Ray:          Well the best thing I ever (had) was a
68                (.) a heated- (.) a toilet seat
69  (.)           ((Int. comes back to the room))
70  Ray:          °Koy- [Koy-° Koyki you haven't got one of
71                Mind
72  ?:                  [hahaha
73  Charlie:      I have in my car
74  Ray:          Heated toilet seat
75  Int.:         A heated toilet seat [in Japan
76  Charlie:                           [a heated seat=
77  Ted:          =Shesheeeh. Right, order plea::se. (        )
78  Ray:          Yes
79  ?:            Just (       )
80  Ray:          Yes. I was wondering what the light was for
81  Ted:          Order please for the lady
82  Int.:         Oh thank you ((for someone giving her seat))
83  Ted:          From the Orient
84  Mary:         Are you doing any degree on that?
85  Int.:         Yes.
86  Ted:          Yes, she'll get a degree. If you give the
87                right answer, she'll got a degree.
88  Int.:         No, no heh, no.
89  Ted:          And when she's a big professor she'll invite
90                You (down/there)
91  Int.:         No heh
92  Ray:          °to Tokyo°
```

Extract 2-1: A lot of work--*Sagyoo takusan*

```
    200  Int.:     Hum (.) What was that article about? You said
    201            That you weren't quite impressed.
    202  Sidney:   Well it was concern(ing) this (.) party of
    203            (.) eh Japanese POWs (.) who had left who
    204            Had been working on the railway in
    205            Thailand(.)
    206  Int.:     Hum
    207  Sidney:   And they were (.) chosen to go to Japan to
    208            Work in the copper mines.
    209  Int.:     Hum
    210  Sidney:   Uh at least working in the mines, they didn't
    211            Stipulate what mines.  Could have been coal
    212            Or anything. But anyway
    213  Int.:     Hum
```

Extract 2-2

```
    214  Sidney:   We finished up we were in the copper mines.
    215            And uh (.) that would be:: (.) in about (.)
    216            Beginning of July (.) when you started work
→   217            (.) sagyoo takusan
→   218  Int.:     I'm sorry?
    219  Sidney:   Sagyoo takusan.
    220  Int.:     Sagyoo takusan,
    221  Sidney:   Humm
    222  Int.:     You mean- Japa-, this is Japanese word
    223  Sidney:   Ha:h?
    224  Int.:     What's, what, what
    225  Mary:     That's what he was saying.
    226            It is a Japanese (.) wor:k.
    227  Int.:     Hum
```

Extract 2-3

```
    228  Sidney:   Sagyoo (.) work, [you know?        [Takusan
    229  Int.:                      [Yeah_ (.) Taku[san means
    230            Many.
    231  Ray:      Sagyoo takusan_ [heh heh heh
    232  Sidney:                   [Sagyoo takusan.
    233  Int.:     Yeah?
    234  Ted:      Shig_o:to, shigo:to.  Sagyoo
    235  (1.0)
    236  Ted:      [(You can't really understand)
    237  Int.:     [Work, yes.
    238  Ted:      Wakarimasuka?
    239  Int.:     Hai, [wa(h)ka(h)rimasu hh ((Eng.:Yes, I
    240                 [            Understand)) ((laughing voice))
    241  Ted:           [Shigoto
    242  Sidney:   [°She doesn't speak Japanese?° ((talking
    243            To Mary))
    245  Mary:     [°She don't (know)°
    246  Ted:      [oh no Shigotoo sagy-h. Japane:se he:dai:
    247            Des.² ((talking to Int.)) SAGYOO, SAGYOO
    248            ((commandingly in a deep voice))
    249  Int.:     Humm
    250  Ted:      Takusan sagyoo ((deeper voice)), you know
    251  Int.:     Ahhh, [hai  (Eng.: ohh, yes)
    252  Ted:            [But [u:h=
    253  Ray:               [hahhhhhah.
    254  Ted:      =Shigoto is more polite I think. °Shigoto,
```

---

² English equivalent is "[Here/it is a] Japanese soldier."

```
256              Shigoto° work, work, [sagyoo
257  Int.:                           [u:mmm, u:mm, ye:s
```

Chapter 6: *Example of redemption narratives*

Extract 1[3]:: Photograph story

```
1     Freddie    I was in Battersea Par:k some years ago,
2                after the war, ten years after the war (1.)
3                and I'm sitting out in the open (air) a cup
4                of tea at the table and two little (0.8)
5                children running around in front of me (2.)
6                and I (said) to myself, "oh my god, >is
7                that< Japanese↓." Because they could be
8                Chinese or (0.8) [Thai, if at any=
9     Int.                        [°hum°       °hum°
10    Freddie    = >you know what I mean<, but to me they
11               were Japanese. (1.0)  I thought (0.8)
12               I didn't have to wo-wonder very long because
13               it's just behind me (there's) somebody
14               calling out "Oi, koi." (1.8) right?
15    (.)
16    Freddie    come here or
17    Int.       [°hum°
18    Freddie    [yeah, I thought (.) I know that↓. (.)
19               That means come here, or means come back.
20               I half reluctantly turned around and the
21               next table behind me was a Japanese man and
22               (    woman    ). (.) They all got up and
23               they went down, stood by the lake. (.)
24               And this is the story. He:h took (.) a
25               picture (.)of his wife and two children
26               (s            and) two children. She:h
27               came (.) and took a picture of him and the
28               two children. (.)  And me being (.) I don't
29               use the camera and all that, >(I      now)<
30               oh↑ but I would, but I would nor↑mally do in
31               a case like that, °and I have done it (.)
32               any times° (.) I would go out and say and
33               "Excuse me >do you mind if<, would you like
34               me to take a photograph of all of you?"
35    Int.       Yes.
36    Freddie    I-I half got up and I thought (.)
37               "°No why should I↓°" (.) And I regretted
38               that. I didn't.  °I regretted it.°
39               But some years later, when I was over at
40               Haruko's place in Croydon, a Japanese (.)
41               man, lady, doctor↑?
42    Maki       Hiro?
43    Freddie    they stood (.).hh on the (      ) stairs
44               by Keiko's room there and I took a
45               photograph with my camera then.  I thought
46               (.) perhaps I've been redeemed at last.
47               -ha hh  You know.h [That's a little thing.
48                                  [hh
49    Int.       Yes.
```

---

[3] Photograph story, No. 9:220 (1'51")

Extract 2: Freddie's story of scalding[4]

Extract 2-1

```
50  Freddie   I think about, you are thinking (.) about
51            reconciliation, [and all that
52  Int.                      [Yes
53  Freddie   There's lots of little things have crept
54            into my mind (.)recently, you know,
55            things I'd not forgotten
56  Int.      Hum
57            (about        ). One particular act of
58            ki:ndness (.) happened to me in Tha:iland
59  Maki      Hum
60  Freddie   by Japane::se and that (.)
61            whether it's kindness or, I don't know.
62  Maki      Hum
63  (4.)
64  Freddie   and I've I probably have written this
67            Somewhere or other as well.
```

Extract 2-2

```
68   Freddie   Working on the railway the railway
69             where I was a concreter Bill (      )
70             nearly half way to [Bumra
71   Bill                         [(      )
72   Freddie   the particular job I'd had on that
73             particular day, there's another chap
74             from Scotland, >I don't know his name<
75             let's call him John
76   Int.      Hum
77   Freddie   Uh, we carried this metal can- metal bucket
78             Thing
79   Int.      Hum
80   Freddie   on a pole, bit of wire bamboo pole
81             with hot water
82   Int.      humm hum
83   Freddie   for tea, you see.  We had hot water and
84             a few bits of stuff and we called it tea.
85             It's one of these days it
86             [was raining, it was very wet and everything
87   Bill      [(       )
88   Freddie   was slippery.  We slipped on a river bank
89             somewhere.  We both got splashed with
90             boiling water there, right [there ((slap))
91   I & M                                [ohhh
92   Freddie   you see:: right then, right↑
93             ((showing with his gesture))
94             I was splashed there ((hitting his thigh
95             with his hand)) and for some unknown reasons
96             he was better got splashed (.)
97             there ((slaps his laps)) obviously,
98             (             ). (.) Right (       )
99             because we didn't have trousers on.
100            We just had bits of shorts, sh[orts
101  I/M                                     [ohh
102            Some shorts didn't have any- just a belt
103            .hh you know .hh.  Uh so, both (   [      )
104  Int.                                        [burned
```

Extract 2-3

---

[4] From Essex transcript (a) version 2(B198); the entire extracts 2s from 2-1 through 2-6 will be provided in the appendices.

```
105  Freddie   This is an interesting point here (.)
106            that (.) he was tattooed (.) both his legs
107            There
108  Int.      Hum
109  Freddie   I wasn't, and he↑ was.  And they were,
110            I don't, they were ladies, whether they
111            were naked ladies, or not I don't know
112            [they were typical la- anyway.
113  Maki      [(              )
114            I think he's got some on his arms.
115            [So, it wasn't long before they blistered
116            [hummm, I see, I see
117  ?         Hum
118  Freddie   And the next morning on (.) there was
119            Nothing
120            you couldn't, (                )
121            There was no↑ medical staff (        )
122            [doing about that.
123  Int.      [hum, hum
124            Well the next morning on, what they called
125            sick parade, they pick out the fittest and
126            all the sickest and that, that's it. (.)
127            >I  mean if you're sick, still went work
128            .hh, but<, on this occa↑sion (.) someone up
129            There decided, you know .hhh, we decided
130            There would be a Japanese medical team
131  M&I       Hum
132  Freddie   on their way to Burma.  And they were
133            in some tents just down the road where our
134            camp was, right.  We didn't know this (.)
135            and this medical team, our officer and a
136            Couple of their (.) >doctors whatever you
137            Might call them< came along and looking
138            at us
139  Maki      Hum
```

Extract 2-4

```
140            And of course (.) I think they were
141            attracted to this chap's legs with his
142            [tattoos (.)showing on them, right
143  Int.      [hum
144  Freddie   more than mine cos I think the Japanese
145            they were a lot more fascinated with tattoos
146            and they picked him out you see↑
147            and of course, he must have said something
148            or they came on and saw my legs and of
149            course we had to tell them what happened (.)
150  Int.      Hum
151  Freddie   and then the officer saw that (      )
152            took us down to these tents (2.) and (.) uh
154            a little section where sort of (.)
155            curtained off and a chair and I sat there
156            and my friend Jock he went in (.) A bit
157            later on well, a little while went by
158            I didn't hear any screams, or anything
159            I thought, oh that sou- sounds all right
160            hhh((laugh)).  A bit worried about this
161            of course .hh ((laughing voice)), and he
162            came out and he got his legs like that (.)
163            all ba:ndaged up [posh poo:hwa:h, you know
164                             [hum hum (              )
165            he went he went out (2.) and I went in.
166            (.) And then (.) cos whoever did it must
```

```
167                have spoken English cos he asked that tattoo
168                and I said I didn't have tattoos and
169                that was it. Anyway a procedure was
170                roughly this.  He just swabbed everything
171                off. I and he got some lint.
172                He cut some lint like a jigsaw puzzle
173                like a jigsaw puzzle, little puzzle (    )
174                pieces (.) He put his these little bits all
176                Separately on there before he put a dressing
177                on anyway. (.) He even wrote us a (.)
178                note to say we haven't got to work (.)
179                till that was better .hhhh, it's true
180                Bill it's true ((laughing voice))
181   Int.& M    Hahahahaha
182   Bill       But did you go to work?
183   Freddie    No, not not for about a week you know
184   Maki       (              ) ((laughing))
185                Our doctor our doctor had to say you know
187                (.) that we were fit
188   Int.       ((laugh))
189   (.)
```

Extract 2-5

```
190   Int.       [°hummm°
191   Freddie    [Now then.  This is a question (.) that
192                I never been able to answer
193                Was that an act of kindness?   (3.)
194                Or was it (.) they needed somebody to
195                Practice on? .hh
196   Bill       Of course they need someone to practice on.
197   Freddie    .hh (.)
198   Int.       Hum
199   Freddie    Or is this just one of these things you'll
200                never explain.
201   Int.       [Are you asking me↑ (.)
202   Freddie    [(            )
203   Int.       my opinion
204   (.)
205   Freddie    Well, no (.) [no I'm just saying
206   Int.                     [my-my, yeah↑
207   Freddie    [generally no, generally no
208   Int.       [you are asking (.) yourself, °yeah?°
209   (.)
210   Freddie    And, it's one of these things over these
211                years I thought to myself well (.)
→ 212                we were meant we were meant (.) to spill
213                that water.  So without that experience
214   Int.       [hum
```

Extract 2-6

215	Freddie	at the <u>ti:me</u> you would have hated all the
216		[Japanese in sight (.) those we didn't ee:
217		Even you know↑, it was the troop side (.)
218		It's just that a little bit there (.)
219		now whether they went on up to Burma (.)
220		whether they survived up there or whether
221		(.) they they, cos they were meant to be
223		tending their own wounded, a lot of their
224		wounded coming passed, coming <u>down</u> (.)
225		through us. Some of them were in te↑rrible
226		state that we sort of felt sorry for them.
227		This is <u>wh:y</u> the Burma veteran thing out
228		in Japan was all a bit of a link with me
229		you think to yourself I saw a lot of poor
230		souls coming down from Burma, back to
231		Singapore when we were on that railway (.)
232		towards the end of the (war/railway?).
233	Bill	War is a <u>was</u>te, isn't it↓.
234	Freddie	There you are.
235	Bill	Now we are talking about another one
236	(.)	
237	Bill	There you are